CONTENTS

OF

No. LXIV.

PAGE

ART. I.—La Petite Chouannerie ; ou, Histoire d'un Collège Breton sous l'Empire. Par A. F. Rio 261

II.—1. Illustrations of the Liturgy and Ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland; being Sermons and Discourses selected from the Works of Eminent Divines who lived during the Seventeenth Century. By James Brogden, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge.

2. Of the Government of Churches: A Discourse pointing at the Primitive Form. By Herbert Thorndike, A.M., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; afterwards Prebendary of Westminster. Edited by the Rev. David Lewis, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

3. A Discourse of the Right of the Church in a Christian State. By Herbert Thorndike, B.D., formerly Prebendary of Westminster. A new Edition, by the Rev. J. S. Brewer, M.A., of Queen's College, Oxford, and Assistant Minister of Ely Chapel, Holborn.

4. Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. Volumes for 1842. 300

III.—Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, in Controversy with the Arians, translated with Notes and Indices. Part I. (Being Vol. VIII. of Library of the Fathers.)..... 389

IV.—1. The Standard and Record Newspapers, on the Contest for the Poetry-Professorship.

2. The Standard and Record, on the Hampden Question. 428

ART. PAGE

V.—1. The History of Pews. A Paper read before the Cambridge Camden Society, on Monday, November 22, 1841. With an Appendix, containing a Report presented to the Society on the Statistics of Pews.

2. Twenty-three Reasons for getting rid of Church Pews.

3. The Ecclesiologist.

4. A Practical Guide to the Duties of Churchwardens in the Execution of their Office. By Charles Grevile Prideaux, of Baliol College, Oxford, M.A., and of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law.

5. Milford Malvoisin; or, Pews and Pewholders. By Francis E. Paget, M.A., Rector of Elford, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford.

6. Charge by Archdeacon Hare.

7. A Charge delivered at the ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester, in July, 1842. By Henry Edward Manning, M A., Archdeacon of Chichester.

8. Suggestions and Instructions of the Incorporated Society for Promoting the Enlargement, Building, and Repairing of Churches and Chapels. As Amended, May, 1842. 436

VI.—1. The City of the Mormons; or, Three Days at Nauvoo in 1842. By the Rev. Henry Caswall, M.A., Author of "America and the American Church," and Professor of Divinity in Kemper College, St. Louis, Missouri.

2. Mormonism in all ages; or, the Rise, Progress, and Causes of Mormonism; with the Biography of its Author and Founder, Joseph Smith, Jun. By Professor J. B. Turner, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois.

3. The Book of Mormon: an Account written by the hand of Mormon, upon Plates taken from the Plates of Nephi, &c. By Joseph Smith, Jun.

4. Times and Seasons. City of Nauvoo, Illinois..... 506

NOTICES OF BOOKS 516

THE

BRITISH CRITIC,

AND

Quarterly Theological Review.

OCTOBER, 1842.

ART. I.—*La Petite Chouannerie; ou, Histoire d'un Collège Breton sous l'Empire.* Par A. F. Rio. 8vo. Londres, 1842.

ONE of the visible ill effects of the interruption of communion in the Catholic Church, is the difficulty with which Christians of different Churches can understand one another. It is not only that their practices and rites are not the same, for these always have varied according to the customs of particular places, but the lamentable fact is that the various parts of Christendom are a mystery to each other. Rome cannot tell what to make of Greece, and Greece and Rome together look with wonder upon England. Each has a theory about the other, but it is in some strange way a mere theory; there are cases which it will not meet, and contradictions which puzzle even those who use it best as a controversial weapon. The fact is, Christians do not kneel from infancy at the same altars. Till Christendom is again visibly one, Christians must remain in a way strangers to each other; they must guess at one another's feelings by outward signs and indications; they must perpetually thwart and shock each other, almost before they are aware of it, just as a sharp pain in the body comes across and startles us, telling us that something wrong is going on, though we hardly know whence the mischief arises. If, therefore, we would throw ourselves into the feelings and modes of thought of our Catholic brethren, we must watch narrowly all that takes place amongst them, as we would gaze upon the features of some beloved friend, to judge of what is going on within him. It is one of the cheering symptoms of the age, that an increasing interest is felt about the prosperity of our neighbours across the channel; and if any portion of the Catholic world deserves attention at this moment, it is France. It is through France that German philosophy is moving northward; she is at this moment the arena on which the Church is combating the wisdom of the powers of this world; and we should have our eyes fixed upon her literature and general tone of feeling: for there is being fought a

battle in which we soon shall have to take our part, if the time be not come already. The disease which now infects society in France is not the wretched atheism of Voltaire; it is a far more attractive and subtle system, an imitation of the Catholic Church, which it would fain combine and modify to suit the taste of this philosophic age. Look into the pages of nearly all the modern French historians; you will find the services of Christianity to the human race acknowledged with enthusiasm, and the Saints eulogized in a way which, if it were not for a tone of bold irreverence, would make the reader suppose that he had before him the productions of a Catholic. Let him go a little further, and he will soon find his error; Catholicism is with them one very beautiful side of human nature, but it has had its day; it suited the infancy of nations, and was a toy for barbarians to play with. In one page St. Augustine figures—in the next, Pelagius; one, according to them, defended fatalism, the other liberty; but each was admirable in his way, for each followed the bent of his nature, and had a perfect right to do so. These are, however, but the external indications of the system; it is founded on a philosophy, evanescent enough certainly, but still a philosophy professing to be based on reasoning. Its professors talk loudly of the oneness of truth; yet, strange to say, this unity consists in its changeableness. Its unity lies in the mind, which is one; so that truth is but the stirring of the great mind of the universe, and its symptom and outward development is human nature. Thus the prevailing opinion in every age is the standard of truth with these philosophers, and the intellectual progress of man is their symbol. "*Le progrès*" has become quite a technical word with them; it is the shibboleth of La Jeune France. We have spared the reader its bold blasphemies on the subject of the nature of God; but with that exception, the above is a tolerably correct outline of the philosophy which has seduced some of the greatest intellects of France; it is even said to number amongst its ranks La Martine and La Mennais. However empty and unsatisfactory it may be in itself, it possesses one great qualification to catch those who are not earnest enough to close at once with Christianity; it looks like Catholicism, without imposing any restraint upon the will or the reason. It allows of brilliant writing and enthusiastic feeling on the glories of the middle ages. It may praise and admire indefinitely, and deck itself out in the beauties of every system; it may ransack the poetry of the whole moral and physical world, for all lies equally open to its libertine taste. In a word, it simulates the unity of Catholicism without the severity of its creed, and all its beauty without its austerity.

The only way to oppose Pantheism is to put forward that

reality which this shameless doctrine imitates; the Church alone can fill the craving void in the heart of France, which she evidently feels so acutely. It is not natural to France to be irreligious; the steady progress of the Church through the turbulent history of the last fifty years is a proof of it. We do not talk at this moment of the French revolution itself—the Church was then under persecution, and therefore sure to flourish; but we would but look back to the time when it was established (such as the establishment was) by the concordat of 1802. The churches were a scene of desolation and ruin; their walls were covered with the obscene figures and inscriptions which had taken the place of the images of the saints; the lead had been torn off the roof, and the bells had been melted to make cannon; the gold and silver ornaments had been sent to the mint. But the most crying evil was the want of clergy; many of the priests had been martyred during the revolution, many had died in exile, and of those who returned, many were so enfeebled by old age and suffering, that they were hardly capable of performing their functions. The whole of the external machinery of the Church was gone, and there were no means of replacing it. In former times monasteries would have become seminaries of education for the priests, but of all these not one remained; Mount St. Michael, Fontevrault, Clairvaux, and Bec, had become either prisons or barracks, and Napoleon was not the man to withdraw either dragoons or felons to make way for monks. In addition to these evils, the youth of the country was drained off to fill the armies of the tyrant, and many a Frenchman who would have become a holy priest, left his bones in Russia, or in any of the four quarters of the globe to which the imperial will was pleased to send him. Yet, amidst all these difficulties, the Church in France has steadily risen; it has survived one more revolution, which had threatened it with destruction: it now finds that it is flattered and courted by the government; princes and state officials crowd its aisles; the archbishop of Paris has at length, in the face of the people who burned his predecessor's palace, walked in procession through the streets of the city. Nor is it in these particulars alone that the Church is holding up her head; the intelligence of the country seems to be turning in her favour; statesmen and laymen have taken up the pen in her defence, and that not as the timid apologists of the outworks of Christianity, but as the defenders of the mediæval Church, with all its calls upon the implicit faith of the age. Frenchmen do not want books of evidences, and Paley would have but a poor chance of being read, if he were translated into French; they want to have the Catholic Church put before them in all its severe beauty, and this has been done in different ways by some

of the most distinguished writers of the age. Of these we need only mention three—Count Montalembert, the author of the Life of St. Elizabeth; M. Azanam, who has employed himself on the scholastic philosophy of the thirteenth century; and M. Rio, the author of the work which stands at the head of this article. We have chosen him to give the reader a notion of Catholic literature in France, because his book is calculated to oppose that which forms the especial danger of the French Church at this moment—that is, a servile dependence on the civil power. To be favoured by the state, or by any one on earth but the "pauperes Christi," is so novel a situation for the French clergy, that they seem tempted to make the most of it. The times of which the work before us treats, should remind them that it is not always best to put their trust in princes, or in any child of man.

M. Rio is already known as the author of a book on the painting of the middle ages, in which he has advanced a proposition which must startle most modern virtuosi, and the whole class of travellers, who derive their notions of painting from Guide-books and Ciceroni. What is commonly called the Revival of the Arts under the Medici, he considers to be an irruption of Paganism; whilst, for all genuine Christian painting, he leads us back to the middle ages. One thing he certainly has proved, that modern painters consider the object of their Art to be the faithful imitation of nature in its external form; the religious artists of ancient times took for their subjects those supernatural emotions which were unknown before Christianity—so that, with them, the outward development was looked upon, not as an end in itself, but as the expression of the mind within. In a modern picture of a martyrdom, the chief object of the painter is to express correctly the anatomy of the martyr's body; a middle-age painter did his best to throw into the martyr's features, and into the outline of his limbs, his triumphant joy and the eagerness of his sacrifice. Painting, according to M. Rio, should be the realization of the invisible; it should give a body and a form to what is spiritual; and this theory he has drawn out with considerable eloquence, and, what is better, with a thoroughly Catholic feeling. The title of his book is singularly, though, for aught we know, accidentally, in accordance with his theory, for it is calculated utterly to puzzle the reader, until he is illuminated by the contents of the book itself. It is called "De la Poésie Chrétienne;" further down there appears on the cover, "Forme de l'Art, Peinture," but whether poetry or painting, or both, is to be the subject of the book, is difficult to discover. Painting certainly appears quite subservient to poetry, and it is not till we get into the work itself, that we find out the meaning of its mysterious title. The

book which we have undertaken to review also bears a title which gives an inadequate idea of what it contains; it is called, "La Petite Chouannerie." Those who know that Chouan is now a nickname for a Carlist, will form a rough guess of its subject; but beyond this, we suspect that even French readers would be puzzled to get a clear notion of the contents from the name. The book has neither preface nor conclusion, and it looks as if it were an episode in a larger work. The narrative is written in the first person plural, as if the author had borne a part in the exploits which he relates; but we are left in the dark as to whether this is the case or not, though some modest asterisks in a poem quoted at p. 297 incline us to suppose that he was a chief mover in the scene which he describes.

"La Petite Chouannerie" proves, on a nearer inspection, to be the history of a number of youths who quitted the College of Vannes, in Brittany, to join the army of Bretons, who in March, 1815, opposed Buonaparte's power. At first sight the subject promises little but battles and bloodshed, which, however interesting, are seldom very edifying spectacles; the author, however, has introduced a variety of details on the state of the French Church under Napoleon, and on the religious spirit of the brave Bretons who then took up arms, and thus has rendered his narrative one of the most charming we have met with for a long time. He has invested his young heroes with a romance which carries us back to the age of chivalry; we can hardly believe that, in the nineteenth century, such a spirit should animate a whole country, as to rouse the peasant from his home and the student from his college, to defend the ministers of religion from oppression. The inhabitants of the western part of France, especially Brittany and Poitou, are a singularly religious race; they remain almost untouched by the spirit of the Revolution, during the greater part of which they were in a state of warfare with its agents. They were a perpetual thorn in the side of the republic, from which they wrested a toleration of religion which extended nowhere beyond the charmed boundary which these brave men, at the expense of their repose and of their blood, created for themselves. If they gained nothing else, at least this preservation from the contagion of irreligion is the reward of their self-devotion. Religious war seems almost a contradiction in terms; but if it be not absolutely unlawful for a Christian to take up arms, the protection of the oppressed and the defence of the Church are the purest motives for which he can turn soldier. If ever, then, there was a cause for which it was meritorious to fight, it was that for which the Bretons and the schoolboys (for really they were no more) of Vannes encountered all the hardships and

dangers of an unequal warfare. It was not a mere caprice which thus led these youths to risk their all in such a cause; it required a settled enthusiasm to endure the pains of a campaign. A soldier's life necessarily implies a severe discipline and strict obedience, lyings on the ground, watchings, cold and hunger, which, strange as it may appear, bear a close resemblance to a monastic rule; and all this, not to speak of the dangers of the field, M. Rio and his companions endured, for the sake of relieving their priests from restrictions put upon them by an usurping government. It is true that they also took up arms for the Bourbons, but the proximate cause which drove them to resistance was, as we shall see, Napoleon's oppressions of the clergy. The principle of passive obedience does not seem, in this case, to come into question at all. It is quite true, that the arms of the Church consist in fasting and prayer—her weapons are the keys which her Lord has entrusted to her keeping; the moment, therefore, that she stirs up her sons to raise an arm of flesh against the powers that be, she quits the high vantage-ground on which Christ has placed her, and descends to take her place amongst the kingdoms of this world. If a temporal power ordained of God orders a Christian to do what is unlawful, he must patiently abide the penalties which the world chooses to inflict, and refuse to execute the command; in this case, passive obedience is unlimited. But the powers which the Vendéens and the Bretons resisted were not the powers ordained of God; the sovereignty of France was vested in Louis XVIII., and his, to all intents and purposes, was the authority which they were called upon to obey. Success alone cannot make an usurper a rightful sovereign; usurpation is a crime, which implies that there is a right and a wrong in the matter, a lawful and an unlawful authority. It is quite true that an usurped power may in time become a rightful one, and it is also true that it is very hard to lay one's finger on the precise time when it does become lawful. But we will venture to say that such was not the case with the government which the Vendéens, and at a later period the students of Vannes, resisted. As for the leaders of the French revolution, with whom the Vendéens waged their noble struggle, it is hard to say in what sense they were a government at all; they were no more the "powers that be" than a gang of highwaymen, who are certainly the successful party when they stop a traveller on the highway. Napoleon, anointed as he was by the Pope, and recognized at once throughout France, might at one time have made out a stronger case; but at the time of the Breton insurrection, his position was completely changed. First of all, he was excommunicated; besides which, scarce a year before he had

abdicated his throne, and France had sworn allegiance to Louis XVIII. Again, it should not be forgotten, that in the eyes of the Bretons, the Bourbons were not only the recognized sovereigns of France, who had been dethroned by an usurper, but also the family in which the kingdom was vested by divine right. If any reigning house in the world could lay claim to such a title, that of St. Louis was the one: for nearly a thousand years, the line of Capet had possessed the throne in uninterrupted succession, during the course of which it had produced many kings who fully deserved the title of Most Christian. They had been the chief support of the Church during the struggle with the German emperors; three Archbishops of Canterbury, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, and St. Edmund, found a refuge with them when all the world had abandoned them; and the race had acquired a new sanctity in the opinion of the faithful Bretons, by the death of Louis XVI. The notion of opposing a lawful authority seems never to have entered into the heads of the people of Brittany and La Vendée; nor can it be said that interested persons excited them to revolt, for the peasants seem uniformly to have been the first to rise, and then voluntarily to put the nobles at their head. These wars were simply the result of the cry of religion within the hearts of a brave and devoted people. This is the great charm of the book now before us; it is the history of men acting, not on calculation, but on the impulse of good and noble motives.

As, however, M. Rio's narrative is but an episode in the wars which so long agitated the western provinces of France, we cannot enter upon the subject without saying a few words on the wars of La Vendée, where commenced the long struggle of which this insurrection of the students is the termination. The picture which we shall endeavour to draw of the religion which animates the peasantry of those countries would be incomplete without an account of what was called "the Catholic army of La Vendée." In the later rising in Brittany, our author frankly avows the indifference of the generality of the leaders of the expedition to the religious wants of the soldiers; so that the devotional spirit which we have noticed seems to have been almost confined to our friends, the students, and to the peasantry. In the former war, which broke out in 1793, nothing occurs to shock one; the republican historians themselves, though they deplore the mistaken superstition of the Vendéens, bear witness to the purity of their motives and to the devotional spirit in which the war was carried on. One of the oldest of their leaders, of the name of Gamber, reappears in M. Rio's pages, and seems to have been a special favourite with the students, as he certainly was with the author, if we may judge by the enthusiastic way in which he mentions

him. Gamber, though the army was only called " l'armée royale," never forgot that he had belonged to " l'armée Catholique." After the long exercises of the day, his troops might be seen in the evening ranged along a hedge, where they were sheltered from the wind, listening to the voice of the old veteran, who was praying with them. When they were obliged to move on Sunday, Gamber's company might be seen as they marched, telling their beads, which they always wore about them; and the flag which was borne before them was sure to bear a device which carried one back to the time of the crusades. They were but keeping up the traditions which had been taught them in the Vendéen war, which, as we have said before, was not a political contest.

The real name of the country, now called La Vendée, is Le Bocage. It is situated to the south of Brittany, on the opposite side of the Loire; as its name implies, it is covered with foliage; not that it can in any sense be called a forest, but each field or small farm is a little patch of ground surrounded by rows of trees, which shut it in; so that seen from an eminence, the whole country looks a large wood, with here and there a church spire, or the pointed turrets of a château piercing through the screen. Few roads traverse this natural labyrinth, and these in the winter time often become the beds of torrents, and are therefore impassable. The gentry lived in isolated châteaux, and were quite a different order of men from the rest of the French noblesse. They lived amongst the peasantry in the greatest concord; their houses were not surrounded by extensive pleasure-grounds, but by the diminutive farms of their tenants, all of whom they knew personally, and whose joys and sorrows they shared. The consequence was that when the National Assembly abolished manorial rights throughout France, the decree was a dead letter in La Vendée, where the peasants continued to pay them as usual. If the Revolution had but let them alone, they might have remained in ignorance of the dreadful scenes which were passing about them; but in its benevolence it was anxious to force its novel blessings of liberty and equality even on those who were bigoted enough to be satisfied as they were. A Report, drawn up by a set of commissioners, sent down from the legislative assembly of Paris, speaks with an amusing simplicity on the cause of the troubles in this singular country. " Religion, or at least religion such as they conceive it, has become to this people the strongest, or, so to speak, the only moral habit of their lives." " In this country, the difficulty of travelling, the simplicity of a life purely agricultural, the lessons of childhood, and the religious symbols, placed as objects, on which men may ever fix their eyes, have laid open their minds to a crowd of superstitious ideas, which, in the

present state of things, no species of illumination can destroy or moderate."*

The tide of revolution, which had so easily inundated France, here first found a check; it rolled back broken from La Vendée. Here was a strange phenomenon for the Dantons and Marats of Paris, something quite beyond their philosophy—a whole people so much in love with their religion, as to have a strange predilection for paying tithes. The first occasion on which the troubles broke out in La Vendée, was the attempt of the Assemblée Constituante to force the oath to the constitution on the clergy. It will be remembered that, by a decree of the French constitution, the possessions of the clergy were confiscated, and themselves reduced to the condition of the paid creatures of the state; all the old dioceses were broken up or suppressed, and the ecclesiastical division of France made one and the same with the civil, so that the bishop was henceforth to be the mere prefect of the department for religious affairs; above all, connection with Rome was strictly forbidden. Those who refused to bind themselves by an oath to this state of things, were deprived of their sees and cures, and constitutional bishops and priests appointed in their stead; at the same time, saving, of course, that they were expelled from their benefices, the free exercise of their religion was granted to those who would not join this schism; or, in revolutionary language, to "l'église des prêtres insermentés." The Assembly did its best to cajole the clergy of France (for so large was the majority of priests who refused the oath that they may be so called) into this new state of things. It appears that by a decree of May 7, 1791, they even charitably allowed them the use of the parochial, that is, of their own churches for the celebration of mass, though they forbade them to perform there any other ceremony; secondly, the same decree permitted them freely to worship elsewhere, if they pleased. How it was met in La Vendée will be seen by a letter of instructions sent to his clergy by the Bishop of Luçon, in whose diocese that country is situated; he commands his clergy not to officiate in their own churches, until they were put into their hands, as the sole rightful possessors of them, lest their flocks should by degrees come to consider it indifferent whether they were fed by the hands of intruders or of their own lawful pastors. He next bids them avail themselves of the permission of freely officiating where they pleased. "In those parishes," he continues, "where there are few landed proprietors in easy circumstances, it will, doubtless, be difficult to find a suitable place of worship, to procure the sacred vessels and vestments; in this case a mere barn, a portable

* Thiers, Revolution Française, tom. ii. Appendix.

altar, a chasuble of chintz or other common stuff, and vessels of pewter, will be sufficient, in case of necessity, for the celebration of the holy mysteries." This extract will give us an idea of the state of the Church in La Vendée at a time when the revolution was inclined to be most tolerant. It seemed, however, as if the poverty of the Church only endeared her the more to her faithful peasantry; the Report to which we have referred complains that nothing was more common than to see in parishes of five or six hundred inhabitants only ten or twelve persons attend mass at the parish church, where it was celebrated by an intruding priest; the rest flocked to their lawful priest, though he officiated at a great distance, in some barn or room, poorly fitted up for the occasion.

The Legislative Assembly, irritated by an opposition which it could not comprehend, proceeded to issue a decree of persecution against all the priests who would not take the oath to the constitution. For some time the king courageously interposed his veto; but after the miserable 10th of August an open persecution commenced, and the refractory priests, as the revolution styled them, were compelled to seek places of concealment. They celebrated the holy mysteries in woods and forests; and the peasants flocked to them in crowds, armed and prepared to defend them to the last drop of their blood. Partial insurrections broke out; and in one place a peasant defended himself most vigorously against the gens-d'armes with a fork; they cried out to him—"Give yourself up;" but his only answer was—"Give me back my God;" at length he fell, after receiving twenty-two sabre-cuts in his body. The immediate cause, therefore, of the wars in the west of France, was the attempt to force an unlawful oath upon the priests; it is curiously illustrative of the unbending temper of the people, that an attempt of a similar kind caused the outbreak in Brittany, in which the students of Vannes took part, and which so many years after closed the contest of which the Vendéen war was the commencement. The revolutionary Report which we have noticed above acquits the priests of all attempts to raise an insurrection; the peasants themselves took up arms simply to protect the ministers of their religion, without any concerted plan. The nobles of the country, who had not emigrated, at their request put themselves at their head, and thus almost undesignedly was formed the Catholic army, which was so long the terror of the republicans at Paris.

The whole of the proceedings of these brave men was marked with the simplicity which characterized the outset of the war. Noble and peasant fought side by side, without distinction of ranks, and the first general in chief of the army was the famous Cathelineau, a poor peasant, who for his piety was called the Saint of Anjou.

The heroic courage with which they fought had not destroyed that simple good nature, which seems to have been their characteristic national feature. Improved, as it was, by Christianity, this quality appears during the war under the form of a wonderful gentleness, which never forsook them in the fiercest contest. Even in that most trying situation for a soldier, the capture of a town by assault, the houses were not plundered, nor the inhabitants ill treated; on one occasion, the taking of Thouars, we find them rushing at once to the churches to ring the bells and to pray. The name of Catholic, which they assumed, was no empty title; on one occasion two soldiers quarrelled, and drew their swords on each other; one of the officers perceiving it, rushed up and exclaimed, "Jesus Christ forgave his murderers—and a soldier of the Catholic army would kill his comrade!" the two men dropped their swords, and rushed into each other's arms. The religious character of the army was not, however, confined to the peasantry; their most famous commander, the Marquis de Lescure, was a man of austere piety, and was called the Saint of Poitou. His courage, when most daring, was never impetuous, and he moved amidst the thickest of the battle as a man who looks death in the face, and is prepared to meet it. His humanity had something angelic about it; once, and once only, his evenness of temper forsook him when the peasants killed a prisoner whom he had ordered them to spare. The man had discharged a firelock at him close to his body; he coolly beat it aside, and merely said, "Take away that prisoner." His soldiers however, indignant at the man's treachery, killed him behind their general's back. One of the many heroic deeds in the history of the war is too characteristic of both general and soldiers to be omitted. Before the attack on Fontenay, May 24, 1793, the men, at the desire of their chiefs, confessed and received absolution before the action, which was likely to prove dangerous, as they had hardly any ammunition, and were literally obliged to charge the artillerymen and knock them down at the mouth of their guns. They were exceedingly anxious to retake one of their canons for which the peasants had a peculiar fondness; they had called it Marie Jeanne, and used to throw their arms about it and encircle it with ribands and wreaths of flowers. At the commencement of the action the soldiers wavered, and M. de Lescure advanced singly before them, crying, "Vive le Roi!" to animate them. At that moment a battery of six pieces was pointed to the spot on which he was standing; his clothes were pierced in many places, but by a miracle he was unwounded. "You see," he said, coolly turning to his men, "they don't know how to fire." The peasants were rushing forward with impetuosity, when a large cross, erected in

former times by a missionary, caught their eyes; they immediately threw themselves on their knees under the very fire of the cannon. One of their officers would have hurried them on; M. de Lescure said quietly to him, "Let them pray to God." They started up from their knees and rushed forward again; we need not ask if Marie Jeanne was retaken. This great man was afterwards killed in the cause which he had so nobly defended; he lingered long after receiving his mortal wound; and some of his last words are recorded by his wife, afterwards Madame de Larochejacquelein. He said to her: "I have fought for God, and I die for Him; I hope in his mercy. I have often looked death in the face, and I do not fear it; I go to heaven in full trust. All I regret is leaving you; I had hoped to be your happiness; if I have ever given you reason to complain of me, forgive me." Soon after his death the royalist army was defeated and dispersed at Savenay; La Vendée was not, however, yet pacified; both there and in Brittany a desultory war was kept up, which lost to a great extent its religious character, and became a cruel and exterminating warfare. Still, in spite of this unhappy termination of the campaign, these brave men had not shed their blood in vain; in 1799 a treaty was framed, by which the churches were restored to the Catholics in Brittany and La Vendée; and the priests were freed from the obnoxious oath which was the original cause of the insurrection. They obtained, as M. Rio tells us, what had been their ultimate object each time that they took up arms—the restoration of the altars and the ministers of Christ.

After this treaty, it appears that these unhappy countries returned for a time to their former peaceful state; the concordat of 1802 tended still more to tranquillize them. It was the interest of Napoleon to appear friendly to the Church, and seminaries were established with the concurrence of the government to supply with new recruits the ranks of the priesthood, which had been so miserably thinned during the Revolution. The College of Vannes, which figures so prominently in the annals of "La Petite Chouannerie," was one of these places of education. It appears that Brittany was very little affected by Napoleon's accession to the empire, and all might have remained tranquil, had the emperor but left the Church independent. It however soon became evident that he intended to make her his instrument in enslaving France, and to draw her ministers into the vortex of imperial centralization. We shall at present merely notice those portions of his ecclesiastical policy which roused the indignation of the Bretons, and reserve the general consideration of his measures to the conclusion of our article.

In 1809, it became known in Brittany that Napoleon had confiscated the patrimony of St. Peter, and had been excommunicated by the Pope; from that moment the Bretons showed a disposition to resist him. They refused to serve in the armies of a man, whom the Church had put under her ban; "Who," they said, "could guarantee a Christian conscript that he should not be ordered to bear part in an expedition shameful as that of the ditch of Vincennes, or the Quirinal hill," from which the Holy Father had been brutally dragged by the imperial soldiers? The villages were deserted, and men quitted their homes and fled for refuge to the darkest recesses of the wild forests of the country, rather than serve in the imperial armies. There does not seem however to have been any general outbreak, till Buonaparte had been once expelled and returned from Elba, for the famous hundred days. One of his last acts in the midst of his disasters had been to endeavour to force the chapters of Troyes, Tournay, and Gand, to receive bishops of his nomination, though the sees were not vacant; their legitimate pastors he had imprisoned and driven into exile, and he now inflicted the same vengeance on those who remained faithful to them. The very youths of the Seminary of Gand he forced into his armies or shut up in prison, where forty-eight of them perished by disease. His first acts on his return corresponded with his exit; by a decree issued April 8th, 1815, he ordered all the public functionaries, not excepting the clergy, to transfer to him the oaths which they had first sworn to Louis XVIII.; on their refusal, he commenced a persecution. This filled up the cup of his infidelity in the eyes of the Bretons; on his attempt to force the conscription upon them, they refused to fight for the enemy of the Church. The cause then which drove the province into resistance, was one which reminds us of the times of Innocent III.; in M. Rio's words, the question was, whether the emperor was to be above the priesthood, and the authority of the préfet above that of the Church.

It was in this insurrection that the students of Vannes took part, and it is around them that the poetry of the expedition concentres. There is a depth of devout feeling in these poor youths, who quitted their home to fight for their religion and their king, which is irresistibly charming. With all their heroism they are still mere boys; they wept bitterly on leaving their mothers and sisters, and one of them cries like a child when wounded in battle, though he had distinguished himself by his determined bravery. At the same time they display in their relations to their masters at college all the petulance of their age; this M. Rio does not attempt to disguise, and he has done well, for it gives a reality to exploits which would otherwise appear disproportioned and un-

true. Scraps of school-boy Latin, and quotations from Tacitus and Livy mixed up with the Maccabees, and the magnificent Latin of the Breviary, occur every now and then to complete the motley impression produced by the whole. The narrative would sometimes appear comic, if the religious courage of the young heroes did not give it a colouring of romance, which carries the reader back to the Crusades. The college seems to have been a place where all the traditions of the wars of La Vendée and Brittany concentred; it numbered amongst its inmates, old candidates for the priesthood, who had formerly quitted the all but monastic stillness of the seminary to serve in these wars, and now after ten years spent in toil and bloodshed humbly took their places on the benches of the college beside boys of half their age, in order to resume the studies which had been so strangely interrupted. The purity of their lives, and the zeal with which they afterwards discharged their holy functions, left their young companions no doubt of the sincerity with which they had embarked in this just quarrel. All therefore combined to kindle the enthusiasm of these young heroes in favour of what they considered to be a sacred war. The state in which they found the villages on going home in 1815 for their vacation was well calculated to add fuel to the flame.

Just before Easter an order came to pull down their beloved white banner from the church steeples, where it had always floated beneath the cross, and to substitute the hateful tricolor. This was a prelude to the conscription, so that that year the Hallelujah of Easter was sung almost in the tone of a funeral chant. The students fully participated in these feelings which animated the province in its resistance, but the immediate causes which led to their final outbreak have a mixture of boyhood, as well as of religion about them, which is eminently characteristic. Before the revolution the head boy in each class wore as the badge of his dignity a small dove, the symbol of the Blessed Spirit, to remind him perpetually of the example of purity which he was bound to hold out to his schoolfellows. The imperial university had profanely substituted an eagle for the dove; this again had at the first restoration given place to a silver cross, enchased with fleur-de-lys. On Buonaparte's return from Elba, an order came to reinstate the eagle in its honours; this was too much for the boys; their devotion for the Holy Ghost was ever kept alive by the chanting of the hymn "Veni Sancte Spiritus," at the opening of their daily studies. Some of them had therefore preferred this sacred badge even to the cross and the fleur-de-lys; and now that the hateful eagle was to be substituted for the old lily of France, their indignation knew no bounds, and they flatly refused to stain their

bosoms, as they termed it, with this new decoration, which they looked upon as an emblem of apostacy. Another grievance of a similar nature had annually recurred to fan the flame of their discontent; Napoleon had taken a fancy to compare himself to Charlemagne, and amongst other acts of ecclesiastical supremacy he had ordered the Church of Aix-la-Chapelle to keep the feast of Charlemagne. He also sent an order to the colleges connected with the university to observe the day of this novel Saint as a holiday. The boys of Vannes, who strongly suspected the quarter from which this order emanated, could not discover the name of Saint Charlemagne in the litanies of the Saints, and at once put him down for some usurper, whom the emperor had canonized of his own authority. What aggravated the insult was that not only was this new festival introduced, but the feasts of Saint Nicholas and Saint Catherine, which had been kept ever since there was a university in France, were at the same time abolished. Saint Nicholas, from the well-known legend of his raising two school-boys to life, had been from time immemorial the protector of children; Saint Catherine was the special patron of all students in philosophy; she is said to have been a virgin of Alexandria, who so ably confuted the most celebrated heathen philosophers in a dispute held before the Emperor Maximin, that they all joyfully confessed Christ and were immediately hurried to the stake. Whoever she was (for her acts are uncertain) she sunk deep into the devotion of Christians; on many painted windows she appears with her joyful palm and her well-known wheel, and angels are said to have conveyed her body to Mount Sinai with songs of triumph. In commemoration of her victory over the wisdom of this world, she has always been invoked by students in heathen philosophy; so that notwithstanding the imperial prohibition, St. Catherine's day was still kept by the upper class at Vannes, and St. Charlemagne's proportionably neglected.

A more serious grievance was soon added to these somewhat school-boy affronts; three of the boys one day returned from a ramble in the fields, with chaplets of white flowers in their hats; it appears that from time immemorial those most faithful guardians of tradition, the boys of Brittany, had thus decked themselves out in the early spring. Some of the revolutionary mob of Vannes however took offence at the hawthorn flowers, white having been ever the colour of the French flag before the Revolution; they fiercely attacked the three boys, one of whom defended himself manfully, and was at length carried off by a party of gens-d'armes as a disturber of the public peace. Without a vestige of a trial he was brutally kicked and beaten by the soldiers, till the blood gushed from his mouth; soon after he was expelled from the college, and

sent to his native village. Here at least he hoped to be at peace; his heart leaped for joy on seeing the belfry of the village church, and he hastened to greet his friends. An edict of the préfet had however preceded him, and all turned their backs upon him. The priest of the place, who had taken the constitutional oath in the Revolution, preached at him from the pulpit, and a few days after a party of gens-d'armes made their appearance at his father's door to carry him off as a conscript; he only escaped by rushing into the neighbouring forest. This was too much for his schoolfellows, and when shortly afterwards news was brought to them that the chief amongst them were to be forced into the ranks of the imperial army by a decree of the préfet of the department, they at once resolved on joining the Bretons, who were everywhere on the point of rising against Napoleon's government. One thing however was necessary before they rushed on this perilous expedition, and that was the permission of the Church, for whose cause they took up arms. This portion of the narrative we give in M. Rio's own words.

"If our enemies had been in the habit of going to church they would have seen enough to make them suspect that it could be no common matter which was thus stirring up these youthful consciences. The confessionals were thronged as at the approach of a first communion; but the features of the boys did not wear that angelic serenity, that look of transfiguration which on that day sheds a kind of beauty over the plainest visages. On this occasion, the penitents had a dogged and anxious air, which betrayed distracting thoughts foreign to the object which brought them there. The most scrupulous among them thought themselves obliged to impart to their confessors the plot which was hatching, and the active part which they meant to take in its development. The clergy, to our great surprise, I had almost said our great scandal, were nearly unanimous in condemning it. Without adopting the words of the imperial Catechism, which threatened eternal damnation to all who refused obedience to his Majesty the Emperor, and without interpreting the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans in the sense of a purely passive submission, they bade us render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, as long as Cæsar did not prevent our rendering to God the things which are God's. They then feelingly reminded us that we had not recognized the authority of our parents in the matter, that all the consequences of our insurrection must be disastrous for ourselves, who might be cut off to a man; for our families, who should be persecuted; and, above all, for the diocese, which should be left without resources from which it could draw recruits to succeed that generation of martyr-priests which was fast failing. In reality, this last was the consideration which had most weight with our spiritual fathers. They feared above all lest the vineyard of the Saviour, which had long lain fallow, and then had been cultivated by a small number of weakly workmen, should now also lose the fruit of their labour; to avert this evil for which no victory bought by

our blood could in their eyes compensate, they made use of all the arguments which their reason or their feelings could suggest. Several heart-rending scenes occurred between the chaplain of the little convent and his penitents. He was the confessor of more than half the scholars of the college, and for each, but above all for the poor, he was a counsellor, a protector, and a father. It was he who had excited our heads and set our hearts on fire by enthusiastic tales about Spain and the Spaniards. Against a power at open war with religion he would have preached, nay marched with a crucifix in his hand; but so long as the Ark of God was respected, his wish was to remain at peace even with the Philistines. Not that he placed an insurrection against any power whatever under the category of mortal sins; on the contrary, he left us free to go or to stay, and when he had spent all his paternal remonstrances, the only means which he employed to withhold us, were the tears which accompanied his parting benediction."

The good priest, from the determined tone in which the secret had been confided to him, probably dreaded lest the matter had gone too far to allow even his authoritative interposition to be availing. The consciences of the youthful casuists were however set at rest, and they now seriously set forward on their dangerous course. We must confess, that, like the old priest, we cannot find it in our hearts to blame these brave boys, many of whom perished in their career of self-devotion. At all events we cannot but think that the sufferings they endured and the dangers which they braved from the most unselfish motives, must be taken into the account before we altogether condemn them. The severest charge that can be brought against them is, that many of them, as we have seen, were candidates for the priesthood; then, if at any time, they should have husbanded their blood, for it was precious, as the future seed of the Church. The generations before them had however set them the example of resistance, and men whom they had been accustomed to revere as holy priests had in their youth quitted the seminary to join the Bretons in arms against the republic. We must not therefore blame them too harshly for a fault which some of them expiated so severely on the field of battle.

We are not going to follow our young heroes throughout the whole of their career; their exploits are far too warlike to appear in our peaceful pages; we shall however endeavour by a general outline to bring out the religious character which appears through the whole of their conduct. We suspect that a few of the circumstances which M. Rio relates will be pronounced by some to belong to the class, which we English comprise under the very laconic formula of French. It however seems somewhat hard that Frenchmen should be blamed for being French, especially as Englishmen are celebrated for exercising the privilege of being English in whatever quarter of the globe they may chance to be.

At the same time it must be allowed that there is a certain mawkish sentimentality which is undoubtedly French, and which has become so more than ever since the Revolution. M. Rio's book is not however tainted with this species of Gallicanism; sentimentality is all very well on certain occasions, but it does not love the sulphurous atmosphere of a field of battle, nor the vicinity of cannon balls. Reserve is a portion of our national character, but we should not for all that pronounce contemptuously upon the strong expressions and outbursts of feeling which characterize a Frenchman, as long as they are natural; and the part which our author bore in the scenes which he describes is a sufficient guarantee for his expressions coming from the heart. But to proceed with our narrative: the students were not alone in their warlike intentions, the whole of Brittany was on the eve of insurrection. During the day time all was apparently peaceful, but scarce had the Angelus sounded when the peasants might be seen rubbing up the rusty firelocks which had served in the old Chouan wars, and organizing companies under various leaders. The women too had their appointed tasks; every morning at sunrise processions were to be seen moving along the plain or crossing each other in some narrow gorge; these were the females of different villages on their way to some chapel specially consecrated to the Blessed Virgin, or to the patron saint of the village church. On learning these preparations, the students at once applied to the Chevalier de Margadel, a gentleman who lived in a neighbouring château, and constituted him their leader. They then determined to consecrate themselves to the cause on which they had embarked, by a special ceremony, the details of which we shall give in the author's own words.

"We should have liked nothing better than to have done the deed in a church, in the face of open day, or else at the fall of evening in an old chapel by the sea side, which had now fallen into ruin. This notion was however overruled by the wiser portion of us, as being by far too imprudent a challenge to the vigilance of the local authorities, and it was decided that, instead of assembling by night in a building specially consecrated to prayer, we should meet at mid-day in the upper story of an insignificant looking house, in the Rue de la Préfecture, nearly fronting the public offices, where we all fully believed that the pacha of our department was drawing up his lists of proscription. A sort of altar was got up in a wretched room, unillumined by a single ray of the sun; a crucifix, borrowed under a most specious pretext, was there placed between four wax tapers which had been smuggled in the night before. It was like going over again one of those ceremonies, at which many of us could remember to have been present in our childhood, which though begun in devotion, often terminated with the mournfulness of a funeral, when the priest stepped down from the altar to mount the scaffold; the

resemblance could not fail to strike every one, and to impress us with a deep seriousness. Accordingly most of us felt an involuntary shuddering either on entering this den, or as he stretched out his hand to touch the Gospels. We felt as much awe as if we were in a church, and some of us were so completely in the power of this illusion that they first put out their hand as if to take holy water, and then mechanically made the sign of the cross. The prime mover in the ceremony was Bainvel, a student in theology, and our future lieutenant; his tonsure and half ecclesiastical habit gave a sort of religious tone to the whole scene. It was he who held in his hand the form of the oath which we had drawn up beforehand; he presented it to each of those who were to take it, as they came one by one to kneel down before the altar."

They swore never to close with usurpation, and to die, if it were necessary, rather than abandon their comrades; the first words were meant for a schoolboy imitation of Hannibal's famous oath; "the second clause was nothing but the sacramental expression of the deep and earnest feeling which, at the approach of a common danger, had taken the place of mere school companionship, and which, at the bivouac and on the field of battle, was soon touchingly to develop into a brotherhood at once of Christians and of soldiers." If it were not for the unfortunate allusion to Hannibal, we might fancy ourselves transported to the time of the crusades; and everywhere throughout the narrative, the same grotesque mixture of the schoolboy and the knight Templar meets us. Soon after this scene, they set out on their expedition. On the morning of their departure, their behaviour must have astounded the good people of Vannes; at break of day all were stirring, and might be seen bending their way to church to be present at the early mass. Even a casual observer would have noticed their features radiant with joy, and their postures of deep devotion, as they lifted up their hearts and made an offering of their lives and bodies to their sacred cause. During the day their exultation found a vent in verses of the Psalms, which they repeated to the wonder and edification of the republican soldiers and inhabitants of the place. One chanted loudly, "Lætatus sum in his quæ dicta sunt mihi;" another voice recited, "Benedictus Dominus Deus meus, qui docet manus meas ad prælium, et digitos meos ad bellum." One of them still more puzzled their adversaries by singing merrily a stave of the famous republican song, the Marseillaise.

"Allons enfants de la patrie,
Le jour de gloire est arrivé."

As soon as the clock struck four, all the students capable of bearing arms, three hundred and fifty in number, by various detachments, quitted the town and repaired to their appointed rendezvous, the château of their chosen leader, the chevalier.

They found all ready for them; his eldest daughter, a beautiful girl of fifteen, distributed amongst them the white cockades, which she and her sister had been employed in working the whole of the previous night; she then tied the cross of St. Louis on her father's breast, and they all set gaily forward, with the setting sun shining brightly about them, and promising them a succession of days as beautiful as that which was now closing. The scene which occurred when they first came up with the Chouan army could hardly, we think, have occurred any where but in Brittany; the behaviour of the sailors certainly gives a brigand look to the whole, which reminds one of the wildness of Salvator Rosa, but with this exception, those who know the habitual devotion of the Breton peasant will at once recognize the truth of the following picture.

"Suddenly we perceived from a rising ground a number of columns of smoke, which arose from a little valley over the hamlet of Brech, and soon after we were able to make out groups of peasants and of sailors, who were heaping wood on the fire under their kettles. Our cry of joy did not require the aid of the echo in order to reach them, and we had no need to answer the *qui vive* of the sentinels to make ourselves known. The whole of this band of countrymen, who had thus on a sudden become our brothers in arms, vied with each other in demonstrations of fraternal kindness; all pressed forward to make us sit down and partake of the dinner, which was boiling in a long file of cauldrons, slung on stakes, which crossed each other at the upper extremity. Never had nuptial feast seemed to us half so good. The sight of those famous Chouans, of whom we had heard so much—the songs and the disputes of the sailors, some of whom it was too evident had broken their fast that day—the noisy voices of the card-players—the anxious air of the older peasants, who were mending their rusty firelocks, and smoking their pipes all the time—the busy labours of the younger men, who were bringing from the village enormous cakes of rye-bread hot from the oven, pitchers of cider, dry fagots to boil the soup, and the wooden bowls out of which they were to eat—all this together made up a scene equally new and striking to us, while at the same time, the confused hum of these various sounds was in itself enough to raise our spirits. All on a sudden the Angelus rung from the steeple of the neighbouring parish church; in a moment the most animated conversations ceased as by enchantment; every face at once grew serious, every head was bared under the burning sun. Though their postures were varied, there was a oneness of expression on their features as each repeated in a low tone the Angel's salutation. All this sudden transformation of a camp into a place of prayer, at once hallowed our enthusiasm, and made us more hopeful than ever of the success of our arms."

It was not long before these young warriors found numerous opportunities of trying their valour; in a desultory combat, which took place soon after near Auray, they chased their opponents to

the gates of Vannes. After the battle they were as much distinguished for their humanity in saving the prisoners, as they had been for their courage in the field. They had miscalculated their own powers of hating, when they took Hannibal for their model; nor was this humanity a mere schoolboy humanity, for if they had chosen to wreak their vengeance on their enemies, the world would not have blamed them. The greater part of them had lost fathers or grandfathers in the Revolution, not in the open field, but in some wholesale massacre or on the scaffold; many of them had seen their mothers perish before their eyes, for the horrid contest spared neither sex or age; and the names of the noble families in the district who had been swept away, and whose inheritance was now occupied by strangers, were fresh in the memory of all. With these domestic wounds still bleeding about them, it required a deeper feeling than common humanity in them to dismiss the prisoners unharmed. The recollections which had inspired them with the power of performing this act of Christian charity, and which had haunted them in the midst of the battle, were drawn from a source which never forsook the Breton peasant. The field on which they had fought was within sight of the church of St. Anne d'Auray, a place consecrated to the Breton by the recollection of numerous pilgrimages, on which he had accompanied his parents from his earliest childhood. The very morning of the battle many of the Chouans were on their knees in the church, when the cry of alarm interrupted their devotions, and made them rush out hastily, signing themselves with the cross; and after the battle, the shrine of St. Anne was covered with the wax tapers, which the peasants brought to burn before the altar, in the chapel specially dedicated to this patron Saint of Brittany. Hatred and revenge could find no place in the hearts of men, whose military ardour was purified by occupations such as these. The feelings which drew the Bretons towards this spot are thus described in the work before us.

"A large share in the events of this day, in a twofold way glorious to the victors, should be attributed to a class of feelings, which the Revolution had but very little weakened in this part of Brittany—I mean religious feelings connected with certain local devotions. In choosing, or rather in accepting, the village of St. Anne for our field of battle, we had more than doubled our chances of success. The Moors might just as well have attacked the Spaniards at St. James of Compostella, as the revolutionary army attack us at this national sanctuary of the province. On such a spot, we should have thought it sacrilege to doubt that an unseen arm was fighting for us. And what could the revolutionary league, though its guns were manned by practised sailors, do against such a religious faith as this, when the faithful had arms in their hands, and the good will to use them? The humble chapel, where many of us had

knelt in prayer that very morning, had become for two centuries a favourite place of devotion for the whole province; its fame had even reached the court of Louis XIII., by means of a number of miracles, attributed to the intercession of St. Anne, who henceforth had been the patron Saint of the Bretons. At the time when this devotion was at its height, whole towns—as, for instance, that of Pont l'Abbé—had remained quite empty for a whole week, during which its inhabitants were absent on a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Anne, whither they had gone in procession, to give thanks to the saint for the cessation of some public calamity. The older inhabitants of the place could still remember the happy time when, on the eve of the festival of the patron saint, more than fifty thousand pilgrims might be reckoned up, encamped on the level ground about the place, where they passed the night telling their beads or singing hymns. But besides the high festivals, on the approach of which all our highways were covered with troops of travellers in their holiday clothes, looking like some extensive and joyous emigration, there were also, and, thanks to the deeply-rooted faith of Brittany, there are still set days on which different parishes, men, women and children, come in procession, with cross and banner, under the burning sky of July and August, to renew their homage to that holy protectress, whom their ancestors had chosen out for themselves in heaven. The maritime parts of Brittany, though far below the others in practice, if not in faith, rouse on this occasion their religion, always rather numbed than actually dead; vessels, gay with flags and streamers, are then descried in the early twilight, their decks covered with a motionless crowd of bareheaded men, and of females in white caps, bearing down in full sail upon Morbihan, and then ascending all together the river Auray. The chanting of litanies and of the 'Ave maris stella,' which is the favourite form of invocation amongst the Breton sailors, is heard from a long distance; the sailors seem, by some tacit understanding, bent on doing their work as noiselessly as possible during the voyage; when arrived at their destination, their exercises of devotion continue uninterrupted; and the scene becomes more than ever edifying to the spectator as they cross in procession the barren flat of Plunéret, and, catching the first glimpse of the holy chapel, fall down in lowliness upon the blessed soil."

Those who have been in any part of Brittany on the Feast of St. Anne, will at once recognize the truth of this picture. Their devotion does not in any way depend on the vastness or splendour of the churches in which they kneel. The flame of Breton devotion requires neither music nor painting, sculpture nor architecture to keep it alive. Near Dinan, in Upper Brittany, there is a rude and insignificant chapel dedicated to St. Anne, on the broken and irregular pavement of which thousands of peasants annually kneel on her principal festival. The road thither is thronged with men and women, who travel all night to be present at the early mass, said at four o'clock in the morning. Many a Breton mother brings her sick child to this chapel of St. Anne,

and goes away happy, because the priest, who sits all that day besides the altar, has placed his stole upon the head of the little sufferer, and pronounced a blessing over it. No wonder the students fought bravely in the vicinity of Auray; brought up, as they were, from their infancy, in such feelings as these. They were not only feelings founded on picturesque associations, but on a firm belief that devotions paid in particular places had a special efficacy about them. So natural is this feeling, that it is really wonderful how it has been possible so thoroughly to root it out of the English mind. Cruel and hardhearted, indeed, were those who made the baneful attempt, and have gained such a mournful victory. They have robbed the English peasant of a source of consolation, which he needs more than ever, now that evils, so unheard of, are pressing him down to the earth. Processions and pilgrimages are useful, if only because they are visible links to bind the soul to the unseen world, because they are actions of religion formalizing and embodying acts of the soul, and thus creating habits within us. Even mere politicians have seen that they have a charm to allay discontent, and to soothe irritated men, who would otherwise fly out in the face of their masters. They have seen that the few moments of recreation, doled out to the labourer by the scanty mercy of his taskmaster, might as well be employed in what was an act of religion as well as a relaxation. It is a mere fact that, amidst sickness and starvation, the peasant does find consolation in praying at places hallowed by the devotions of former generations. Let them at least enjoy the delusion, say benevolent persons; the prayers of the saint may have no power to save her child, but still the mother may as well fancy that they have. Such are the discoveries of modern politicians, and ancient politicians were just as wise; truly they were wise in their generation, who desecrated the tombs of the saints, and scattered their ashes to the four winds. Who knows what might have happened had St. Thomas's bones remained undisturbed at Canterbury? Who knows that the dead faith of some slumbering churchman might not have been warmed by their vicinity just as the dead man was raised to life by contact with the bones of Elisha. Henry's rage was not impotent; he has succeeded in cutting off a real power from the Church. It was not, however, by way of exciting the imagination, as men gaze upon a picture, or on any Utilitarian view whatever, that the brave Bretons prayed in St. Anne's Church at Auray, before the battle. Their faith was too simple for any such refinement; and they believed that their prayers were more efficacious there than anywhere else. We believe that their notions on the subject will be found to be most Christian as well as most natural. Just as

Christianity, in ennobling the soul has also ennobled the body, above all that the boldest fancy could have conceived, so in opening eternity upon us, it has also given us deeper views of space and time; it has made them sacramental. Days and places, specially dedicated to the saints, are means to us of communion with them; they not only remind us of them, and lead us to contemplate their lives, but they give us a special interest in the prayers which those blessed spirits offer up day and night before the throne; they are means by which we call around us the chariots of God, even thousands of angels; the spirits of just men made perfect, and all the hosts of the heavenly Jerusalem, to which even now, upon earth, we are come. It is undeniable that we, in England, do not realize the communion of saints; nor shall we, until we revive the old Catholic practices, by which the Church on earth connected her devotions with the intercessions of the Church triumphant in heaven.

The campaign, which thus called the students of Vannes from their college, was fortunately for them very short; it began in the spring of 1815, and continued, with various success, though generally in favour of the Chouans, till the July of that same year, when Waterloo and the return of the Bourbons put an end to all hostilities. It probably was fortunate for them that it was so; for there is no saying how long their religion would have held out against the unavoidable licence of a camp, especially as their leaders in this war were by no means so attentive to the spiritual wants of the army as had been the heroes of the old wars in La Vendée. They assigned to the students an old sergeant as a commander, who, however eligible as a soldier, was certainly not the best fitted to edify so young and inexperienced a troop. He garnished his words of command with a set of oaths which astonished ears accustomed to the quiet of a seminary. The consequence was, that they never allowed him to assume the command of them; this post of honour was assigned to two of the oldest amongst them, who, from having received the tonsure, though not yet in orders, "were looked upon by them as the anointed of the Lord." Notwithstanding the jeers of the veteran, they persisted in signing themselves with the cross in the midst of the battle; and never intermitted the short prayer, which they offered up, before lying down to sleep, pell-mell, in some barn or other comfortless dormitory, though their profane instructor exclaimed against their unmilitary proceeding. One of them was even known more than once to awake a young *protégé* of his from his first sleep to make him say his prayers, which he had omitted; he reminded him that, in the desperate game that they were playing, a Christian should always lie down to sleep as though

the morrow was to be the day of his death. Throughout the whole of this campaign, in which many of them perished, the students kept up the same devoted character; and after all was over, returned to their college, and became schoolboys again; many of them afterwards, as appears in the course of the history, became priests.

We have hitherto principally dwelt on the pleasing picture, which M. Rio's book presents, of a believing people. In few parts of the world has Christianity sunk so deep into the hearts of the people as in Brittany; whilst the Church in most other places seems to be a struggling minority, there the marks of faith meet one on all sides. To us Englishmen, especially, it is an edifying sight to see the churches filled from one end to the other with crowds of men and women kneeling on the hard pavement; even the steps and the space around the porch are often covered with peasants on their knees in the open air, intently watching for the time of the elevation. Such descriptions as those with which M. Rio has furnished us are a lesson to us which might draw us from the intrenchments in which our insular pride and fancied purity have placed us, and bid us open our hearts to our continental brethren. The narrative of which we have given a sketch, may, however, as we have before hinted, be a warning to our neighbours across the Channel as well as to ourselves. It may serve to remind the French Church of a time which it seems but too much in danger of forgetting, the time when the clergy so nobly came forth from the horrors of the revolution, bearing upon them the glorious marks of their Lord. Gallicanism is now at an end; the French Church is no longer in danger of becoming the feudal vassal of a monarch; it now declares that it has no politics. In a country, however, of revolutions such as France, this may be only equivalent to being of all politics in turn: it may mean that the Church goes with the stream, and adopts whatever idols the populace may choose to set up. The Church should not be of, but it should be above the politics of the world; she should direct and guide them. Her children in times of difficulty look up to her and call upon her to speak before they take their sides. Those who have lately watched the relations of the Church in France with the state, cannot but be anxious lest she should become the mere echo of the government which is now courting her. It is quite true that the clergy under the powerful protection of Louis Philippe, are lifting up their heads; the archbishop's mitre, and the golden tissue of the copes and dalmatics of the clergy seem to be as necessary to state ceremonials as the presence of the king himself. At the same time the part lately taken by the Church in

the processions which accompanied Napoleon's bones to the grave make us fear lest her ministrations should become a mere portion of a state pageant, and her words, each of which is a sacrament, be repeated to the dictation of a court official. A picture in which Napoleon is the chief figure is the altar-piece of the Madeleine; and the memorable occasion on which Lacordaire preached in that cathedral in the habit of the order which he has so nobly entered was stained by a panegyric on the same personage. It seems to be the fashion to consider him as a patron of the Church, and to compare him to Charlemagne. It is not in a spirit of contempt that these observations are made; alas! the Church of England is not in a condition to rebuke other Churches for subserviency to the state; we would rather bid them take warning by our miseries, and beware how they bind around themselves the chains under which we are groaning.

The insurrection of which M. Rio's book contains an account, was provoked by the oppressions which this novel Charlemagne exercised against the Church, and the details which the author gives of his proceedings, few as they are, may serve to remind the French clergy of what they really owe to Napoleon. The account given by him of the Emperor's proceedings is mixed up with allusions to the times of the French revolution, and with sundry terms, such as *prêtre concordataire, petite église,* &c., which are unintelligible to most English readers; we shall, therefore, before we conclude, briefly fill up the sketch which he has drawn. We have noticed above the first steps taken by the National Assembly with respect to the clergy. Their decree did not touch the doctrine of the Church; but, without the pretence of consulting her ministers, it violated every ecclesiastical law; it made the bishops mere civil officers, dependent for their election on men who might be Jews or infidels, and deriving their mission and jurisdiction from the people's representatives. In a word, it wished to cut off the French Church from unity with Rome and the Catholic world, and to wrap it up closely in the embraces of the National Assembly. The Church behaved most nobly; of 135 bishops all but four* refused to accede to this new constitution. They were immediately expelled from their sees, and others consecrated by Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, and by two schismatical suffragans, were substituted in their stead. At first the

* The four bishops who took the oath were Cardinal de Brienne, Archbishop of Sens, and the Bishops of Orleans, Viviers and Autun. It has been often said that the Archbishop of Paris also apostatized; this mistake, however, arises from confounding the real Archbishop with the schismatical Gobel, Bishop of Lydda, who became constitutional Archbishop of Paris; M. de Juigné, who then held the see, had been driven into exile two years before.

persecution stopped here; the Assembly was too wise to proceed further, and one of its members was even heard to say, "These wretches of priests are very anxious to have the honours of martyrdom; but we are not such fools as to make saints of them." The constitutional bishops, however, soon discovered that their functions were very much embarrassed by the presence of the legitimate pastors, into whose seat they had intruded themselves. This had been foreseen in the debates on the property of the Church in the Assembly. One of the deputies had said of the bishops, "Take from them their cross of gold, they will carry about a cross of wood. It was a wooden cross which saved the world."

Accordingly, so large a portion of the priests and people of the dioceses adhered to the Church, poor as it was, and stripped of all external dignity, that it became absolutely necessary to drive the bishops out of France; they were insulted, imprisoned, and dragged before the revolutionary tribunals. The greater part of them went into exile in the year 1792; those who remained had to sustain the full storm of revolutionary fury. Whatever may have been the corruptions of the French Church, they were not such as to prevent every rank of the clergy from furnishing new members to the glorious army of martyrs and confessors, and thus proving to the world that the principle of life remained within her as vigorous as ever. In most of the principal towns of France, Meaux, Châlons, Rennes, Lyons, the clergy were hunted down and massacred in crowds. One scene, which took place at Paris, may serve as a specimen of the fury of the mob and the heroic patience of the martyrs. During the reign of terror the thirst of the people for blood rose to madness; cruelty ceased to be the result of a sudden paroxysm of rage, it became the one passion of their soul, and was carried on with a systematic coolness perfectly astonishing. In the first beginning of their fury, however, the case was different; it was necessary that they should taste blood before they could get to relish it, and it was by the massacre of the priests that they gained this new appetite. On the memorable 26th of August all the priests who refused the oath had been ordered into banishment; this was, however, soon found to be far too lenient a measure to suit the taste of the new preachers of liberty and equality; the convents of Paris were converted into prisons, and were soon filled to overflowing with objects of the hatred or fanatical suspicion of the mob. The Carmelite Convent, especially, was filled with ecclesiastics of all ranks to the number of 180; amongst them were the Archbishop of Arles, and two brothers of the name of La Rochefoucault, one Bishop of Beauvais, the other of Saintes. On the morning of the 2d of September, word was brought to the convent that an armed mob had been whetting its thirst for destruction on the prisoners confined in the Abbey

of St. Germain, and had already put itself in motion, with horrid shrieks of "Aux Carmes," which left no doubt of its destination. The priests knew well what these demonstations meant, and prepared for death; they repaired to the church, where they first confessed and received absolution from each other; at each of the altars of the church a priest then celebrated mass, and his brethren knelt around him to receive the viaticum at his hands. They were singing the benediction of the holy sacrament, when the howlings of the mob were heard without, and the dreadful procession, armed with sabres, guns, and pikes, soon streamed into the church. Their first act was to drive out the priests into the garden of the convent, whither the illustrious victims repaired, chanting the prayers for departing souls, amidst the cries and imprecations of their murderers. There was a small chapel at the bottom of the garden, at the altar of which stood the Archbishop, surrounded by several priests who wished to die near him. One of the mob cried out, "Where is the Archbishop of Arles?" on which a priest, the Abbé de Panonie, stepped forward, wishing to save him; "Are you the Archbishop?" repeated the ruffian. The Abbé, unwilling to tell a falsehood, merely bent his eyes on the ground, on which the Archbishop, perceiving his friend's intention, advanced and met his murderer with a countenance radiant with joy. He was at once cut down with a sabre, and fell, bathed in his blood, at the foot of the cross, and died, saying, "I pardon you, God have pity on you." After this blessed soul had thus offered up himself as the first fruits of the noble band, an indiscriminate slaughter took place. Sometimes the strength of the ruffians was worn out with their exertions in pursuing and striking down the priests amongst the trees of the garden; they then stopped, and proposed to their victims to take the oath to the constitution; the only answer which they received was, "We had rather die." Again the dreadful work recommenced, so that only forty priests out of the whole number escaped. These massacres were general throughout the prisons of Paris; on the 2d and 3d of September 250 ecclesiastics are said to have perished. This is but one amongst the many scenes which the Revolution exhibited. The three we have mentioned are not the only bishops martyred at this time: others languished in putrid dungeons, and all but the four mentioned above were at least exiled. The priests followed the example of their pastors; 700 of them worked in chains on board the hulks at Rochefort, where many of them died from the effects of the suffocating atmosphere which they breathed.

The condition of the faithful under such a state of things may well be guessed. We have seen what it was in La Vendée, M. Rio has thus described their state in Brittany:—"From the moment that the persecution broke out against the priests, the child could not

learn his catechism, nor receive his first communion, without being a partaker of their dangers. As the reign of terror went on, each new sacrament brought with it a new exposure to death; mothers, as each time came round, braved the danger with their children, and when the towns were emptied of their priests, they used to send their families into the country to serve this apprenticeship in Christianity." A great many priests remained in France disguised, and such was the respect which they inspired, that even the gens-d'armes were known, in spite of their employers, to beg of them to exercise their holy functions. The exiled bishops in very many cases governed their dioceses, through vicars general, in the very teeth of the constitutional intruders; the faithful, then, were not deprived of the sacraments, though they had to obtain them at the risk of their lives. Glorious, indeed, was the state of the Church when the very children were confessors from their infancy, and when being a Catholic was equivalent to being a candidate for martyrdom. Many specious arguments might have been urged for the constitution; it was said that no essentials were touched, that only the external machinery of the Church was changed. The French bishops, however, were well aware that the real question at issue was, whether the French Church should be materialized, and as it were absorbed into the world; they suffered for their adherence to the Holy See, the proper medium of communion with the Catholic Church. It was not, however, in France alone that the great Antichristian power of the French Republic aimed at extirpating Christianity; the Church suffered also in the person of its head, Pius VI. The Directory, amongst the conditions of a treaty, required of him to withdraw his condemnation of the constitutional clergy. As was expected, he refused, and the French general in Italy, on some assumed grievance, received orders "to make the tiara shake on the head of the pretended chief of the Universal Church." The Pope was made prisoner and dragged from place to place till he died at Valence, August 29, 1799.

The French Directory now flattered themselves that the Church was dead with the earthly representative of her divine head; short-sighted men! they set their signet on the tomb and placed a watch around it—could they have looked forward but two short years, they would have seen their own idol, whom they had set up, lending his hand to restore the Church to the earthly honours of which they had robbed her, only to make her heavenly glories the more radiant. Little did the imperial despot know with what powers he was meddling when he re-established the Church; he fancied that he was only adding a lustre to his own triumph, but he was all the while but a blind instrument in the hands of God. Our limited space will not

allow us to go fully into the details connected with the concordat of 1802; we shall confine ourselves to such circumstances as are proper to bring out the nature of Napoleon's relations with the Holy See. It is strange that he should have recourse to Rome at all in the matter, especially as many persons about him are known to have urged him to set up a Gallican Church, without communion with the rest of Christendom. With that strange instinct, however, which extraordinary men possess, he rejected the idea; he would have his church Catholic, since such was the will of the majority of the nation, and the notion of a Catholic Church out of communion with Rome does not seem to have struck him. "Many persons," said he to Bourienne, "would have me found a Gallican Church, and make myself its head; but those men do not know France; if they had known it they should have known that the majority are very far from this rupture with Rome. The Pope must push me to extremities before I make up my mind to it; but I do not think it will be so." The same conversation records his reasons for restoring religion. "In all countries religion is useful to the government; it must be used as an instrument for acting upon men. As a matter of police the religion of a state should be absolutely in the hands of him who governs it." From Rome alone could the despot obtain possession of the heavenly powers of which he wished to make use as a stepping-stone to his exaltation; to Rome, therefore, he applied. His anxiety for the success of the negociation may be inferred from his instructions to his ambassador, "Treat the Pope," he said, "as if he were master of 200,000 men." On this most military estimate of the greatness of his Holiness the ambassador acted, and the concordat was concluded. We are not going to enter into its details; suffice it that it corrected the crying evil of the constitution, by prescribing that canonical institution was to come from Rome, on the same footing as before the Revolution. One of its provisions we must notice, because it was the origin of that lamentable schism of the French Church noticed by M. Rio under the name of "la petite église." In order to facilitate the arrangements of the concordat, all the bishops of the old dioceses of France who had survived the Revolution were required to send in their resignations to the Pope. Of the 135 bishops, 51 were dead, 45 obeyed the command, 36 refused;* no attention, however, was paid to their remonstrances, and the sees of France were remodelled without their concurrence. We are not, of course, in a situation to judge how far the exigencies of the case called for this harsh measure, but we can at all events see that none but the sternest necessity could justify a deed which at one blow cut off from their flocks the pastors who had borne the brunt of the Revo-

* The Bishops of Autun, Viviers and Orleans, make up the number.

lution, and that at the very moment that they expected to be united to them. La petite église was, and we believe is still composed of the few priests who refused to accede to the concordat, principally on account of this measure; the bishops, who at first refused to send in their resignation, have deprived them of all pretext for their schism by abstaining from the exercise of their jurisdiction, and by placing their resignation in the hands of Louis XVIII., preparatory to the concordat of 1817.

Such was the measure by which the Church was recognised by the state in France; we shall see how Buonaparte dealt with the heavenly powers with which he had come in contact. His first act was to publish a set of articles called organic, which made the bishops dependent on himself for the exercise of their functions; they could not even confer orders without his consent. It is probable that these articles were never perfectly obeyed; some of the bishops, it is true, were guilty of even profane adulation to the Emperor, but they do not seem to have gone so far as to submit their powers of ordination to the civil power; in every diocese but one, in spite of his known will, orders were conferred before the age of 25, and dispensations even procured from Rome for the ordination of deacons under age,* in order to fill up the breaches which the Revolution had caused in the ranks of the clergy. Napoleon not only published these articles without the knowledge of the Pope, but even published them in such a way as to make it appear that they were a part and parcel of the concordat, which the Holy See had sanctioned. Another piece of treachery on the part of the Emperor was the appointment of twelve of the constitutional bishops to the new sees. The Pope has been blamed for his want of firmness in quietly allowing these men to become rulers of the Church of France. He was, however, deceived by one of the emissaries of Napoleon, who assured him that they had renounced the constitution.† However yielding Pius VII. was in other respects, on this one point he was firm, and made a vigorous stand against the imperial will. Every thing else the Pope was willing to give up; Cardinal Gonsalvi in his name declared that "his Holiness is ready to pass over all canonical rules, all but doctrine;" he acknowledged that one concession which he made "had no example in the eighteen centuries of the Church," but he would not accept the constitutional bishops without a retractation of their errors. "Such a measure," he says, "would wound the substance of the deposit of the faith; besides which the conscience of the Holy Father and the obligations of his apostolic office oppose insurmountable obstacles to it." By the year 1804, when the Pope was at Paris, all but two

* Lecanu, Histoire des Evêques de Coutances, p. 510.

† Mem. pour servir à l'Hist. Eccl. vol. 3, p. 421.

had submitted themselves to the Holy See. Napoleon did his best to entrap the Pope into receiving these, in spite of their refusing to do what was required of them. The formula which they were ordered to sign contained a declaration that they "adhered and submitted themselves to the decisions which had emanated from the Holy See, on the ecclesiastical affairs of France." It appears that the refractory bishops were by express agreement to be excluded from the ceremony of the coronation;* on the evening, however, before the Emperor was crowned, he read over to the Pope in a hurried manner a paper purporting to be the retractation of one of the refractory bishops. His Holiness took home the paper, and on reading it discovered that the word "canonical" had been substituted for "ecclesiastical." He immediately wrote to Napoleon to signify that he could not accept it, and to beg him to take measures that nothing should "trouble or stain the august ceremony which was to take place the next day." Napoleon felt that he was foiled, and fretted exceedingly at the power which the quiet dignity of the Pontiff exercised over him; the result was that before Pius VII. had left Paris, all the bishops had, at least externally, submitted to him.

Such was Napoleon's conduct before he broke with the Holy See: he flattered himself that the benefit which he had conferred upon God's Church, by raising it from a state of persecution, was to be repaid by its abject submission. The Church was to be one of the steps under his imperial throne, and to be satisfied with being covered with cloth of gold and velvet, as the price of being trodden under his feet. He little knew athwart what powers he had come; the poor passive Church became an earthquake, which opened under him and swallowed his ill-gotten throne. After his coronation, he delighted to compare himself to Charlemagne; and in the whole of his relations with Rome there is a grotesque attempt to play the part of the holy protector of the Church, an affectation of pious language which betrayed how unfitted he was for the post which he had assumed. Napoleon was a man fitted to rule by his strange and almost supernatural acuteness, by his stern and unbending resolution in pursuing his objects; he was most dangerous from his wily and unscrupulous policy, and the fascination of his smile, which was celebrated for its sweetness, was only a type of the smooth treachery of his conduct; but with all these qualities of the successful usurper, there is nothing princely about him; the insignia of Charlemagne, from which he copied his coronation robes, hung awkwardly on the shoulders of the bold soldier of fortune. All this only serves to show how misplaced seemed in him the lan-

* Artaud, Vie de Pie VII., from which the greater part of this account is taken.

guage and bearing of the feudal head of "the holy Roman empire," of the first Christian prince, which he endeavoured to assume in his relations to the Holy See. The first occasion on which the Pope and he came into direct collision seems to have been the marriage of one of his brothers, who had, during a journey to America, privately married an American lady and a Protestant; Napoleon, for reasons of state, wished the Pope to pronounce a divorce. In his exceeding zeal for Catholicism he urged his request on the plea of the disparity of religion. "It is important," he writes, "that no Protestant girl should be in such close relation to me." The Pope, however, refused his request; the sanctity of marriage amongst Christian princes is the point of all others which the Holy See has most scrupulously guarded. It will be found that half the quarrels of the popes with kings in the middle ages resulted from the inflexible justice with which they defended the cause of queens whom their husbands wished to repudiate; Innocent III. and Ingeburga will at once suggest themselves to every one. In a long and dignified letter Pius VII. endeavoured to make Napoleon understand the unreasonableness of his request. The Church, he argued, however it condemned mixed marriages, did not divorce those who had contracted them. "That difference of religion, which is considered by the Church to be an impediment involving separation, has no place in the case of baptized persons, even though one of them be not in the Catholic communion."

Napoleon chafed and fretted at distinctions which were too subtle for his military understanding, but in vain; the Pope was immovable. It was not long, however, before the Emperor's aggressions entirely altered even the outward show of friendly relations between the two powers. Only six months after Pius had left France, the imperial troops took possession of Ancona; in violation of a concordat which had been passed for the Italian republic in 1803, he seized on the property of the Church, suppressed monasteries, and decided every thing according to his sovereign will even in churches immediately dependant on the Holy See; the Pope only answered by refusing to grant bulls to the Italian bishops of his nomination. It was not long before he took steps to swallow up the Papal States in the empire which he was forming on the continent; he proposed to the Pope to join the Rhenish confederacy, and demanded that the ports of Ancona and of Civita Vecchia should be shut against the English; in other words he ordered the Pope to quit the neutrality which became the head of the Church, and to become a partisan in his wholesale system of oppression. The answer of his Holiness was as firm as it was dignified. In a letter to

the emperor he says, "We cannot yield to anything which interferes with the guardianship of the deposit of the patrimony of the Roman Church, which has been transmitted to us through so long a series of ages by our predecessors, and which, in the presence of Almighty God, at the foot of the altar, and with the most sacred oaths, we have promised to transmit inviolate to our successors." To Napoleon's demand that the English should be expelled from the ports, he answered in a strain of holy indignation, "We, Vicar of the Everlasting Word, who is not the God of quarrel, but the God of concord, who is come into the world to expel enmities, and to preach the gospel of peace 'both to those who are near and to those who are far off,' (such are the words of the apostle) how can we in any way deviate from the instruction of our divine Founder? How can we belie the mission to which we have been appointed?" He declares that he is prepared to retire to a convent, or into the catacombs, after the example of the first successors of St. Peter, rather than give up the trust which had been put into his hands. Napoleon's anger at this unwonted opposition to his will may well be conceived; at one moment he was even discontented at the narrow bounds assigned to him in the division of power into spiritual and temporal, and thus protested against the usurpation, "Think of the insolence of these priests, who in their partition of authority with the temporal power, as they call it, keep for themselves the power of acting on the intellect, on the noble portion of man, and pretend to confine my sphere of action to the body; they take the soul to themselves, and then throw me the carcase." Such a man was not likely to have much respect for the chair of St. Peter. He takes the tone of an injured person, as thus, with a curious mixture of cant, he details his grievances:—"I will always preserve towards your Holiness, the head of our religion, that filial deference which I have shown to you in all circumstances; but I am accountable before God, who has, in his goodness, willed to make use of my arm in re-establishing religion; how can I then without groaning see religion endangered by the delays of the court of Rome, where affairs are protracted without end; where, for the sake of worldly interests, of vain prerogatives of the tiara, souls, the true foundation of religion, are left to perish? They shall answer for it before God, who leave Germany in anarchy; they shall answer before God whose zeal for the protection of Protestant marriages is so great, that they would oblige me to bind my family to Protestant princes; they shall answer before God who delay the despatch of bulls for *my* bishops, and give up *my* dioceses to anarchy."

From the tone of this letter Napoleon would have us believe that

it was a holy zeal for Catholicism which induced him on the 2d of February, 1808, to send his troops to take possession of Rome, and the next year by a formal decree to unite the patrimony of St. Peter to the French empire. This last deed exhausted the patience of the Holy Father, and he excommunicated the Emperor. Amidst the astounding events which follow one another with lightning speed in the history of Napoleon, this little act of the Pope's is almost imperceptible, but who knows what unseen powers fought with England against him whom the Church had condemned? With all his indifference, Napoleon showed great uneasiness when he heard the news;* he, however, assumed a lofty tone, and wrote to Eugene Beauharnais in the same hypocritical strain which had characterized his letters to the Pope; "Does the Pope think," says he, "that the arms will fall from the hands of my soldiers?" Could he have looked forward a few years, he would have seen that this was precisely what did happen to him; the numbed fingers of his soldiers refused to bear their arms in the memorable Russian campaign.

The events which followed this excommunication show more than ever the real object of Napoleon in restoring the Church in France; since he could not make the Pope his liege-vassal, he determined to destroy the line of St. Peter. On the 6th of July the Pope was dragged from Rome and conveyed to Savona. In the case of Pius VI. the Directory had allowed the cardinals to disperse themselves, and thus to get beyond their power; on the death of that Pope a sudden fortune of war had driven the French from Italy, and enabled the cardinals to assemble for the election of Pius VII.; scarcely had he taken possession of Rome, when the battle of Marengo put the north of Italy again into the hands of the French; it seemed as if Providence had swept them away on purpose to clear the way for the election of a new Pontiff. Napoleon determined that this should not happen again; all the cardinals, except those whose age rendered the journey impossible, were conveyed to Paris; the annulus Piscatoris was also taken thither and shown in triumph. If ever Rome seemed on the eve of perishing, it was then. Napoleon's whole efforts were now bent on effecting a separation between the French Church and the Holy See; for this purpose he turned theologian; he raked up all the old maxims of the Gallican Church, and the famous four articles of 1682, which may be called the symbol of Gallicanism, were ever in his mouth. The Pope, however, was by no means impotent; though all communication between the Church and her head was strictly cut off, though the cardinals and even his confessor were removed from him, though he was

* Bourienne, vol. 8, c. 14.

obliged to write by stealth, and pens, ink and paper were removed from him, still he had only to suffer and remain passive; he alone had powers which were necessary to his enemies, and his mere inaction was sufficient to vanquish the Emperor. He refused canonical institution to the bishops appointed by Napoleon, and issued mandates annulling the jurisdiction of Cardinal Maury, who had taken upon him the archbishopric of Paris. What Napoleon had now to do was to make it appear that the chapters might give jurisdiction without the Pope; to this end he imprisoned cardinals, bishops, and theologians who held a contrary opinion; he drew his sword on the vicar-general of the diocese of Paris (that Abbé d'Astros mentioned by M. Rio), who obeyed the Pope in rejecting Cardinal Maury. This new reformer must needs uphold the primitive discipline and the privileges of chapters, and declaim about the Gallican liberties at the very time when he was imprisoning French bishops and forcing them to send in their resignations.

In order to further his views, he at length conceived the plan of a national council, that is, a council of the bishops of France and Italy. Ninety-five bishops accordingly assembled at Notre Dame, on the 17th of June, 1811; they were not, however, so tractable as Napoleon expected; it is true that a party of bishops was found disposed to pay a servile obedience to the civil power, and the remonstrances addressed to the Emperor on the subject of the imprisonment of the Pope were but feeble; still the principles of the Roman See were upheld in a manner which entirely foiled the despot's purpose. He endeavoured to overawe them by the unexpected presence of his Ministre des Cultes, who even claimed a voice in the council; the bishops, however, silenced him. Napoleon next manœuvred to obtain the assent of the council to an address to himself, favouring his views; it was, however, indignantly rejected. The very outset of the proceedings displeased him, for Cardinal Fesch, the president of the council, on his knees took the oath of Pius IV., and administered it to every member in turn. At length, when a commission appointed by the fathers had reported its decision that a council was incompetent, without previously consulting the Pope, to enter on the question of the canonical institution of bishops, even in case of necessity, Napoleon by a decree dissolved the refractory assembly. His next steps were such as to remind us very much more of the Arian Constantius than of Charlemagne: he arrested the Bishops of Gand, of Tournay, and of Troyes, who had been foremost in resisting his will, and shut them up in the dungeons of Vincennes; we have already noticed the subsequent persecution which they and their faithful chapters endured at his hands up to

the very last moment that he remained in France. After this act of tyranny, he summoned all the bishops of the council who had not left Paris to the presence of his faithful Ministre des Cultes, who was instructed to school them one by one in their duty. The consequence of this was that eighty bishops agreed to receive a decree proposed to them, purporting that in case of the Pope's refusal, the Metropolitan was to proceed to grant institution to the bishop elect. This was a miserable falling off from the former firmness of the bishops; the Emperor had succeeded in intimidating them, and this was the result of their fears. They, however, appended a clause to the decree, by which they supplicated his Majesty to allow them to present the decree to the Pope for confirmation. He is said to have confirmed it, but in such terms as shocked the imperial counsellors to such a degree that the negotiation was broken off.

Such was the result of Napoleon's famous council, in which he discovered, notwithstanding the weakness of so many of the bishops, that the Church was a more unmanageable power than he had anticipated. He ordered all its acts to be destroyed; an uncertainty, therefore, hangs over some of its details, but one thing is certain, the Emperor felt that he was foiled, and resorted to other measures. In June, 1812, the Pope was carried away from Savona and dragged to Fontainebleau; here a new species of temptation awaited him; he was surrounded by prelates devoted to Napoleon, who were instructed to weary out his patience by perpetual entreaties, by representing to him the evils of the Church as the result of his unyielding opposition. Nothing came of this novel system of persecution till January, 1813. The Emperor, amidst the disasters resulting from the Russian campaign, had still leisure to torment his illustrious captive. After besieging him with the entreaties of the prelates of his own party, he himself unexpectedly entered his apartments. What passed during the interview was never known for certain, but in a few days the articles of an agreement between his Holiness and Napoleon were published. By this unhappy document Pius agreed to remain in France, to give up the patrimony of St. Peter, and to allow the Metropolitan to give canonical institution to a bishop in case he himself did not do so within a given period. Thus, after years of a noble resistance, Pius VII. in a moment of weakness gave up what his predecessors would rather die than have yielded. It is not wonderful that he acted thus, considering the temptations which surrounded him; still the truth cannot be denied, Pius was not a Gregory or an Innocent. It is said that the great reason which induced him to yield was the misery which his companions in exile were suffering on his account,

and the confusion which reigned in the Church, now that all channels of communication with her head were cut off. Had, however, St. Gregory VII. started back at the sight of the inextricable confusion into which his opposition to Henry had plunged Christendom, at the miserable wars which it had excited, the Church might now have been but a vassal of the state. Our object, however, is not to examine the conduct of the Pope, but to prove how unworthy was Napoleon of the honourable titles which have been heaped upon him. The remainder of the story is soon told: Pius VII. soon recovered from the fault which he had committed, and retracted his concessions. This, of course, cost him a more rigorous imprisonment than before; his deliverance, however, was at hand. This is the most wonderful part of the whole tale, which, in all its parts, looks like romance. Now that the succession of St. Peter seemed about to die in the person of a weak old man, now that Rome seemed to be abandoned by all, even by the Pope, Providence made use of England, Protestant, at all events, in her government, and of Russia, no less Protestant in her hatred of the Holy See, to raise the Papacy from the dust, and to restore the Holy Father to his dominions.

Many are the lessons to be derived from this history, which we have thus cursorily analyzed. Providence thus most wonderfully interposed to save the See of St. Peter, when it may be said to have been at its last gasp; but still every one must acknowledge that the transactions might have been more glorious for it than they were. If we may be allowed to judge of these events, it does seem as if the concordat of 1802 was the original mistake of the whole series of measures. Concessions were then agreed to, which made it appear that Buonaparte was conferring a favour on the Church by patronizing it. When we consider that the Church lands were given up for ever, the whole ecclesiastical geography of France altered at once, ancient bishoprics done away, bishops who had been confessors in the Revolution ejected, and others who had been schismatics substituted for them, are we not tempted to say that it would have been a thousand times better for the Church of France to have worn still for a time the glorious robe of martyrdom, than thus give herself up into the hands of such a man as Napoleon? The Church has powers in her hands of which the rulers of the world, be they kings or republicans, lawful sovereigns or usurpers, stand in need; they may persecute and thrust her into dungeons, but this will not serve their purpose; her sufferings will only serve to endear her to the people, and to gather the faithful around her standard, till in the end, by the mere natural course of events, the powers

of the world are compelled to bow down before her. Their interest is to cajole her into giving up into their hands the direction of the mighty powers which belong to her, to make her mission and jurisdiction proceed from them; the powers themselves they can never hope to obtain, their object, therefore, is to control the exercise of them. This was what Napoleon wanted; had the Church of France remained in her former state of persecution, a "spectacle unto the world, to angels and to men," had Pius VII. refused to allow the Church to be established on conditions which made it appear that the advantage was all on her side, Napoleon could never have attempted to make her his slave; she would have been utterly beyond his power. We should then have heard nothing of the Catechisme de l'Empire, which roused the indignation of our brave Bretons, of National Council or of Charlemagne. The French Church is again in danger of trusting herself to the embraces of the state, now that court favour again shines upon her; but let not the clergy suppose that their strength lies in funeral processions in honour of oppressors of the Church, or in prayers for the martyrs of the three glorious days. The great difficulty under which they at present labour is the restriction put by the state upon education. No government office, under which class are comprised a far greater number of employments than with us, can be filled by one who has not been educated in a government school. The larger ecclesiastical seminaries, therefore, contain hardly any laymen, the smaller schools of the clergy alone educate them to any extent; after a certain age they are drafted off into schools under the controul of what is called the university, a body of no religious principles whatever. The late contests, however, in which this same university endeavoured to get even these *petits seminaires* into its hands, prove where the strength of the Church lies. Fathers of families from all parts of the kingdom sent up petitions to the Chambers against the measure; if the last generation is infidel, at least it determines that its posterity shall be Christian. The nation is growing weary of revolution and irreligion; let the Church but keep aloof from the powers of the world, let her treat with them as their superior, and all who are sick of the world will flock to her for protection. If M. Rio's book serves to remind his countrymen that under Napoleon the Church gained nothing but oppression by her concessions, he will have done them a far greater service than the mere detail of the adventures of his young heroes would seem to promise.

ART. II.—1. *Illustrations of the Liturgy and Ritual of the United Church of England and Ireland: being Sermons and Discourses, selected from the Works of Eminent Divines who lived during the Seventeenth Century.* By James Brogden, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge. In Three Volumes. London: Murray. 1842.

2. *Of the Government of Churches: A Discourse pointing at the Primitive Form.* By Herbert Thorndike, A. M., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; afterwards Prebendary of Westminster. Edited by the Rev. David Lewis, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford. Stewart: London. 1841.

3. *A Discourse of the Right of the Church in a Christian State.* By Herbert Thorndike, B.D., formerly Prebendary of Westminster. A new Edition, by the Rev. J. S. Brewer, M.A., of Queen's College, Oxford, and Assistant Minister of Ely Chapel, Holborn. London: Cleaver. 1841.

4. *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology.* Volumes for 1842. Parker and Rivingtons.

IT is not uninteresting, nor altogether unprofitable, in times of change and movement, occasionally to enjoy the liberty of a spectator, and observe how far opinions, whatever they may be, which are the subjects of contention, have advanced or retrograded. That opportunity has been afforded lately, by the appearance of an article in the first and most influential periodical of the day, on the subject of these opinions, and having especial reference to the judgment of our "divines of the seventeeth century." It is now about ten years since certain members of the University of Oxford began to put forward, by means of tracts and other publications, various high Church doctrines, which they asserted, and which all agree, had been for a long time laid aside or but indifferently maintained in our Church. These doctrines, which are mainly those of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Tradition, Church Authority, Apostolical Succession, or points connected with them, they supported by catenæ or quotations from our standard divines, which proved clearly and irresistibly that such had been not only held, but authoritatively taught in our Church, and that therefore, though popular opinion was at present against them, as tending to popery, they not only might be held and taught again, but had positive prescription on their side. If our memory fails us not, the appeal to those divines was received at the time in a way any thing but complimentary or respectful to their authority. The language was—we will not say *totidem verbis*, but in effect—

why evoke from their quiet and obscurity a set of musty and moth-eaten folios, to sit in judgment upon us—why sound a retreat from the nineteenth to the seventeenth century—why restrain our present race of clergy to the dicta of such remote predecessors. We have the Bible, and are content with it—the Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.—Such, if we remember right, was the kind of language which the appeal to our divines at the time elicited; but such is *not* the language which any moderate, any decent churchman can hold now, after the strong and decisive acknowledgment of them, made in the influential quarter just mentioned. It has been pronounced from that quarter, and in a tone of authority befitting the high reputation both of the writer and of the Review, that the theology of those divines "*is the standard theology of the English Church.*" Few will be found, we imagine, so hardy as to dispute the fact, after such an affirmation of it. Farther—this theology is declared to be "a signal proof of Divine favour to the Church," and its "value and authority" to consist not only in "*à priori* marks of truth," but "in its *doctrinal soundness on particular points:*" those particular points being, we presume, among others, the doctrines above enumerated, of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Tradition, Church Authority, and the Apostolical Succession. Nay, their high views are represented to have soared even above the liturgy and formularies of our reformed Church; for it is admitted "that they did not contemplate her as perfect," and that though they thought on the one hand, "the Liturgy might be made worse," they also thought on the other, that it "*might be made better,*" in what direction it is of course needless to state, though it may be well just to mention, that the improvements contemplated by our divines affected principally the communion office, and were designed to make it express more prominently the doctrines of the Real Presence, and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And on such a view the conclusion is very naturally drawn, that "if assistance is wanted in determining questions (*e. g.* on the doctrines abovementioned), it is wise to ask it of those whom the Church has so long held up to our respect, and not to permit *ourselves to sit in judgment* on the controversy;" and that "if peace and unity are to be sought, it must be by rallying round authorities, whom *all sides* may be willing to acknowledge, or at least none can repudiate." We cannot but express a fear, that our general will have more difficulty in "*rallying*" his men of "*all sides,*" than he seems at present aware of: a good many are in a sadly undisciplined state, and if he begins so magisterially, with telling them that they must—no help for it, they *must cease* "*judging for*

themselves," and believe all that Laud and Bramhall, Hammond and Ken tell them, we are afraid the effect may be such an excitement of feeling, as will compel him to withdraw quicker than his sound divinity and benevolent intentions deserve.

Nor is this high tribute paid to the doctrines of our divines only, but also to the religious and self-imposed discipline they practised. We are thankful to see full justice done to "Laud's patience under martyrdom, a martyrdom not of one stroke, but of many years passed under barbarous libellings and other bitter and grievous scorns" from the nonconformist party: to "Andrewes's life of prayer and his book of private devotions, found worn in pieces by his fingers and wet with his tears:" to "Hammond's fastings and prayers, fastings for six and thirty hours, and prayers more than seven times a day:" to "Whitgift's solace and repose in often dining with his poor brethren at Croydon:" to "Sanderson's abstinence:" to "Bramhall's noble exertions for the Irish Church:" to "Morton's daily alms, his single meal, his straw bed at eighty years of age:" to Cosin's princely magnificence to his first born, the Church:" to "Ken's Sunday feasts with his twelve poor parishioners." And still more pleased are we to be told that "these lights of holiness and goodness are not accidents or strange phenomena in the system of the English Church, but true and faithful portraitures of her character and doctrine." We question, indeed, whether either their fasts or their feasts will be much to the taste of our popular religionists. We hardly imagine that "*all sides*" will quite agree with the writer, and are afraid an amiable simplicity makes him suppose people more docile than they really are.

But to return.—We have been the more particular in acknowledging these voluntary and spontaneous testimonies to high Church doctrine, and its authoritative position in our Church, because the main bearing of the article is decidedly in the opposite direction, and tends to undo and nullify this testimony—we do not say, in the intention of the writer, but in the view of the popular reader and the world at large. There is an illogical tendency in ordinary minds, when the sanction of any school has been claimed and proved for *certain* points, to imagine that sanction undone, because the same cannot be proved for certain *other* points; to suppose that agreement clear and manifest on certain subjects, is null and void, because it does not apply to *all*. Now we do not say at present, whether this is or is not the position in which the "Oxford writers" stand to the divines of the seventeenth century, on the subject of Rome, Church and State, &c.: we are only now concerned with the fact, that the reviewer has attempted to prove this; and before at all entering into that ques-

tion itself, we beg to assert *in limine*, that however decided, it does not interfere one iota with the use to which throughout the late controversies the authority of our divines has been turned. The writings of those divines have been appealed to for certain definite doctrines, and have been appealed to effectually: beyond a doubt the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, of the Real Presence, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, of Tradition, of Church Authority, and the Apostolical Succession, are to be found asserted over and over again in their writings, by any one who will use his eyes. On these and the like points a perfect agreement exists between the former and the latter writers. Nor does our contemporary even intend to disprove it. He wishes to prove not that our divines did not hold *those* doctrines, but that they did not hold certain *other* views and certain *other* language, which he asserts the Oxford writers indulge in, viz. a mode of speaking of the Church of Rome, of the alliance of Church and State, which in his view shows a considerable departure from the tone of their predecessors. He only *wishes* to prove *this sort* of departure from them—so far from the former being his object, he asserts the catholicity of their teaching in the strongest and most feeling manner: nor do we suspect him throughout of any intention to diminish this idea of it. We would only guard against an illogical inference, which those who think differently from himself, would fain draw from his argument; and we repeat, that that argument does not at all interfere, or, even come into contact, with what has been asserted of those divines, or in the shape of catenæ, extracted from them, on the subject of these particular doctrines. Take, *e. g.* the first point, the strong language of those divines against Rome—how can any reasonable man say that this nullifies their testimony, *e. g.* on the Eucharistic Sacrifice? They are two facts, separate independent facts, both of which may be true together. The existence of the one no more tends to deprive the other of existence, than the fact of the earth revolving round itself, tends to destroy the fact of its revolving round the sun as well. Nay, if people will remember, the language of those divines against Rome was specially mentioned at the time that their authority was thus appealed to, and mentioned for the special purpose of enforcing that authority; proving, as it did, that persons might hold those doctrines without being Papists, and therefore that Anglicans had no excuse for not holding them. All this was said years ago, and repeated over and over again in the tracts and elsewhere; and therefore what room there was for any mighty discovery on the subject just now, it is not easy to say. However, persons seem to be pleased with the discovery which has been lately made for them, and are forward with an inference

of their own.—Oh, (addressing the Oxford writers,) so your great Catholic divines turn out after all as good Protestants as ourselves, and therefore there is no need to be concerned any more about their doctrines.—A very natural, we allow, though a somewhat uncultivated style of logic: it is so tempting when our prepossessions are flattered by any intelligence, to suppose that all other agreeable things must follow therefrom, never mind whether they have any thing to do with it or not; to erect it into a kind of general charter of inference, a *cornucopia* of charming deductions of every kind. Persons yield themselves to the soft influence of a congenial statement, to the mesmeric movement, which subdues by quietly waiving the controversy. There is, in short, a kind of argumentative legerdemain, a light-fingered method of inserting a conclusion, which is often successful, but which, in the present instance, happens to have been anticipated. Certainly we would say to such arguers as these, if our divines were Protestants, be it so; we will not quarrel about names. You are, however, as late in your inference, as you are in your discovery: you are forestalled by one of several years standing, drawn expressly from that fact, which exactly suits you; the simple one, viz., that for that very reason, you have no sort of plea for rejecting these high Catholic doctrines. What! not concern yourselves for their doctrines because they were Protestants—you cannot mean to say that; and therefore, with your leave, we shall continue to affirm that our divines, Protestants though they profess themselves, held most indubitably the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Tradition, Church Authority, and the Apostolical Succession:—and consequently to call upon you, Protestants though you are, to hold, to believe, and to teach the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Tradition, Church Authority, and the Apostolical Succession.

We will allow them however to put their argument in another shape; we will suppose them to say—you adhere to the language of our divines on some subjects, depart from it upon others; have not we a right to do the same? We agree with their language against Rome, disagree with it upon the Sacraments; what right have you to give yourselves a licence upon the former point, and allow us none upon the latter?—To which we answer, all the right in the world, because there is all the difference in the world in the nature of the two subjects. The doctrines on the Church and Sacraments for which we stand out are *de fide;* they are part of the creed, they are the doctrines of the Catholic Church from the earliest times: but can the same be said of certain opinions respecting a particular Church? The very idea is ridiculous. Grant-

ing they be ever so strongly held by our divines, what person in his senses can think they form an article of faith, a fundamental of religion? Surely when you come into this department, you leave the necessary, the immutable, the Catholic, and are dealing with variable, mixed, and contingent mattter. That this or that Church, at this or that period, is more or less corrupt and so on, may be *matter of fact*, may be *historically true*, but can never be converted into a Christian *dogma*, a part of the essential faith. It is subject-matter surely, if any other, in which difference of opinion may be tolerated: depending, as it does, upon all kinds of irregular channels of truth, documents, information, intercourse, experience, and the like, it is exposed to innumerable chances of error; and therefore it may fairly admit of altered or modified statements, according as these means of knowledge become more or less accurate, or accessible.

Let the charges then of our contemporary be ever so true (and the reader must remember that we have only been *supposing* it), —we say once for all—they do not interfere in the least with the argument to be derived from the particular doctrinal statements made by our divines. The controversy with the popular Protestant remains exactly on the ground on which it always did: he obliges his opponent to admit, what—why the very fact *which that very opponent has voluntarily obtruded upon him from the first*, viz. that our divines were not Papists, and had no prejudices in favour of Rome. If a victory of this kind is easily won, it has at any rate the advantage of being easily borne. Meantime, let it be remembered, those doctrinal statements remain irrevocably the language of our standard divines. Even the Quarterly Reviewer, we tell those persons who are so quick in turning his arguments their own way—even the Quarterly Reviewer will not let you off there. Even he insists on your being high-churchmen—yes, you must believe whatever Laud and Bramhall, Jeremy Taylor and Ken, tell you upon these subjects—you must "*not allow yourselves to sit in judgment on the controversy.*" He and "the Oxford writers" are entirely agreed on this point: he cordially joins them in calling on you to hold, to believe, and to teach, what our divines did—the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Tradition, Church Authority, and the Apostolical Succession.

And now to proceed to the charge against the "Oxford School" of a departure from the tone of our standard divines. It should be remembered first of all that the difference, if such there be, is not between very strong language against Rome, and none at all. The chief writers of the present movement have expressed themselves very freely, and very decisively against Romish cor-

ruptions. If there were any necessity for quoting on this occasion, or if one were not tired of responding to these kind of appeals, and touchstones of orthodoxy, passages without end might be taken from the writings of Mr. Froude, Mr. Newman, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and Mr. Williams, reflecting most strongly upon those corruptions. There are differences however, we own, in their mode of speaking; among others a great difference in the fact that the modern churchman draws attention to the *good* points of the Roman system, as well as the *bad;* whereas the old controversialist against Rome confined himself to the bad. And here we might very safely, we think, leave the explanation, simply claiming for the modern churchman the right of censuring the faults of Rome in his own way, and if he chooses to think them faults not of her creed itself, but of the popular interpretation of it within her pale, claiming for him that liberty also. The reviewer himself allows that such moderation *may* proceed from "an humble and amiable spirit"—then why not, on the common principle of charity, give these writers the credit of it?

We have a duty however to fulfil to our divines, and we confess that though we have all along admitted that they were Protestants (as they called themselves), nay urged it when we had occasion to do so, we have, nevertheless, no wish to see them made out to be Protestants of the present day, persons who gave opposition to Rome the first place in their creed, and sound doctrines the second, or none at all. And yet such is the impression which the ordinary Protestant reader (of course skipping or putting aside as so much sentiment, all the Reviewer's own sprinklings of high Churchmanship), goes off with from a catena—some fifty pages close print, of strong passages from Anglican divines against the Church of Rome. By the time he has swallowed a hundred extracts, his imagination is strongly affected, he thinks of course that our old divines did nothing but talk against Rome, and he images our standard divinity as a kind of perpetually going pump, or torrent of anti-Romish epithets, amongst which figure conspicuously the words "Babylon," "Jezebel," "Antichrist," and the like; for the passages have been selected with a proper view to effect. Whatever other opponents may appear on the stage, Brownists, Anabaptists, Presbyterians, Nonconformists, are naturally lost sight of in the all absorbing opposition to the Church of Rome which pervades the scene. And were it not for certain historical associations which attach to the English Episcopate of those days, he would come to the conclusion that they were the legitimate precursors of the orators of Exeter Hall.

We do not of course accuse the Reviewer of intending this, but we do beg leave to find fault with the careless, superficial,

indiscrimating and confused representation he gives of our Church divines. He would persuade us that they all talked, and thought, and wrote exactly alike; he allows no difference, no modification, no shading off of opinion amongst them, nothing to break the force of one long, wearisome, monotonous note against the Church of Rome. He converts them not so much into a mere crowd, (for that would admit of some freedom and variety), as into a *herd* or *flock* of divines; and as every species of animal has a noise peculiar to itself, as oxen low, and horses neigh, so he very respectfully allows our divines what he supposes to be the peculiar noise of the species, the anti-popery one. His charmed ears are penetrated with this, and hear nothing else; they answer his purpose better as a *herd*, uttering one uniform, irrational cry, than as a succession of rational writers, as they were, who often used the liberty of reason *for differing from each other, on the very subjects here spoken of*, nay often spoke differently themselves at different times of their lives: who in short, *though members of the same Church, were far from being all of the same school, and who developed, as a body, into different views in a later age, to those which they had held in a former.* It was probable, however, that some distasteful facts might get out, if his one note were ever allowed to pass into proper articulation and rational variety.

And as the writer confounds and mixes all our Divines together, so he wholly omits any reference to the peculiar state of things under which they wrote, or if he accidentally hits upon it, giving it the slightest weight as interpretative of their language and their views. If two such important elements in forming a judgment of any school of writers, as *its internal parts and texture, and its external situation and circumstances*, be wholly omitted, there is of course room for exhibiting them in any exaggerated light that it may be thought desirable they should appear in; but it is evident on the plainest principles of reason, that these two considerations may alter the case materially: we say it is evident that they *may;* whether they do or not, or rather whether we show it or not, we leave to those of our readers, who will cast their eye over the following suggestions, to decide.

I. Allowing then, as we readily do, that we do not wish to revive the language in which many of our divines speak of the Roman Church, what, after all, we ask at starting, is the necessary weight of hostile language, and even hostile feelings, between two parties, as proving any *radical or any deep disagreement* between them? It is a *primâ facie* evidence, certainly: and it *may* be something more; but not *necessarily*. Parties both in religion and politics often use the fiercest tone to each other, when there is hardly an atom of difference in their principles. This has been

even so common, as to have produced a very general and popular opinion, that *the nearer any sects agree, the more they are sure to hate each other:* according to which theory, hostile feeling is a decided presumption in favour of agreement in principle. The Archbishop of Dublin went so far as to argue on this view for the admission of Jews into parliament; because being of an entirely different religion from the established Church, they were likely to have much less hostile feelings towards it than the common run of Christian sects. We are not inclined ourselves to pursue the maxim quite so far, but yet *valeat quantum:* there is a certain degree of truth in it. There is such a thing as hostility by *position*, as opposed to the hostility of *principle*. Two men shoulder one another in the streets, a spark is elicited by the collision, and charge and retort alternate, till the cracker is spent. Our thoroughfares are daily witnesses of those rapid and concentrated emotions. You turn a corner and come across the mimic of an *immortale odium*, yes, and a tolerably good one two—two heroes in the Homeric language, or two draymen or porters in the English, are before you, in attitude of defiance—"upon their crests sits horror plumed,"—an awful spectacle. What dark and fathomless source of hatred has been opened between them? Why how deep or fathomless soever, all has flowed, we believe, from the impingement of the one's waggon wheels on the other's waggon wheels: something there may have been more or less mystical underneath, but this is all that appears on the surface. This, then, is an instance of hostility by *position*. To take a larger field. Time was that French and English looked upon themselves as natural born enemies, and thought it a sacred duty to hate one another: English and Scotch the same. It is a maxim that border nations always fight, neighbours quarrel, "doctors differ," and men of the same trade "never agree." These are enmities of position. In a word, persons are brought into collision, stand in each other's way, interfere with, cross each other, and an enmity ensues: it is not that there is any ἐναντιότης, any inmost or radical, or metaphysical repugnance of one being to another being; the outsides, the human husks and shells are rather the parties performing upon each other. In this way two theological schools, two Churches do not disagree in principle, because they quarrel and use hard words. Disagreement of some sort is shown certainly; but to *what extent* does not appear; it *may* be to a serious, it *may* be to a very trifling degree; *violence of language does not prove radical difference*, because such language does not proceed on any principle of necessary proportion, but, given *a* ground, given *some* room, it works upon it indefinitely. And therefore if any one brings us a string of hostile passages from Anglican divines

against the Church of Rome, we reply *in limine*, that these do not *necessarily* prove any radical difference between the two Churches: they *may* do, but it has still to be proved. They may be strong expressions of *temper* only, or they may be expressions of a deep eternal difference: which of the two has to be shown.

Now this the Quarterly Reviewer has not done; he has merely thrown a set of passages together; and therefore another article is at any rate necessary to complete his case. Nay, all that appears is decidedly on the other side. The *Church* of Rome he allows most generously to escape as a *Church*, to slip entirely through his fingers.—For first, whether right or wrong, we, he admits, cannot judge her.—"*Error must always be tested by an appeal to authority—no private judgment, not even a sister Church can pronounce authoritatively against another sister:*" and secondly, he seems, on his own part, to decide in her favour—"*Rome has carefully guarded all her authoritative statements*, so as to secure herself some plausible defence against the attacks on her *formal system*, while she reaps the full benefit of the errors which she *privately encourages in her popular teaching*." What is this but to say, that her *formal creed* is defensible, while her error is confined to her "*popular teaching*"—the very distinction that is drawn in No. 90. And thinking as he does, that her formal creed is defensible,* of course *he does not even intend in his article to prove that our divines attack it.*" What do they attack, then, according to him? Why, it would seem a certain system of "*Popery*," the meaning of which he leaves very much in the dark, but which we gather is an ambitious corrupt system working *within* the Church, not really identical with her; including particularly the Jesuitical doctrines. And therefore the controversy between the two Churches, strong and violent as it was, did not touch, according to him, their respective *principles*, or creeds: and so must be supposed to have been one of the class, more violent than deep, that we have noticed. A multitude of causes kept the two in constant collision. Besides religious disagreements, there were political pretensions made by the Roman court, which produced, of course, the greatest jealousy and dislike of her. The Pope claimed the power of deposing kings, and had actually deposed by his bulls both Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth. The Jesuits, who had just developed their system, strongly favoured these claims: their agents were at work here, what doing it is not very easy to say, amidst so much conflicting evidence that has come down, but they were all naturally suspected of the worst designs. The State was hard upon the "Recusants" in conse-

* For a statement which always admits of a plausible defence, *because it has been carefully guarded*, is certainly a statement which cannot be disproved.

quence, and treated them with rigour, and even sometimes with cruelty. The supposed *moral* code of the Jesuits cominginto notice, in addition to their *political*, increased the general distrust, not only of them, but the whole Church that encouraged them. Moderate minds would see the distinctions that Roman Catholics themselves have made, and not identify a school with the Church; but many confounded the two. And this general atmosphere of distrust was not relieved by the lengthened controversy between the divines of both sides. Combating, skirmishing, and collision of all kinds were the order of the day; nor do we doubt that the records of the contest may furnish the most ample material to any one who is disposed to make the charitable use of it, to which it is now put. But it is obvious how much of this may be referred to the hostile *position* of the two Churches, rather than to any deeper cause. Causes to begin with there were of course, or such a position could not have arisen: but granted any deep enough for this purpose (and every body knows they need not be very fundamental ones), and the position works *of itself* afterward, and produces hostile language indefinitely. These historical features of the contest quite harmonize with our contemporary's withdrawal of Rome's *formal* system as a subject of attack; and the consequent interpretation of the Anti-Roman language of our divines, to apply to her corrupt *practical* system. As this, however, is not generally admitted, and as the reviewer contradicts himself on the point, we will pursue it a little farther.

Looking then to the circumstances under which our divines wrote, it must be obvious to the most ordinary reader of history that they were of a kind peculiarly, nay, almost irresistibly, calculated to elicit all their opposition to the unsound and corrupt parts of the Romish system, to the exclusion of their agreement and sympathy with the other; a point which deserves being particularly attended to, because the charge brought against the "Oxford writers" is not so much that they do *not find faults*, and very great faults, in Rome, which their pages abundantly show, as that they *do find great excellences and beauties* in her. We say, the time succeeding the Reformation was especially a time to make one-sidedness most natural, nay, even legitimate, if it ever can be legitimate. Our Church had just passed out of a vast system of practical corruptions both of discipline and doctrine; she had passed out of it, whether unscathed or not, it is not necessary here to determine; she had left a former and very unsound state of things behind her. Pardons and indulgences openly dispensed on the merest pecuniary grounds; virtual image-worship to a great extent tolerated and encouraged; extortions and usurpations on the part of the Roman See; great corruption of morals among

the clergy; institutions ineffective; and the whole Church deadened and enfeebled;—such was the parting view the nation had had of the Roman Catholic system. This state of things swept away with a high hand, and a new one arisen which depended for its very legitimacy on the faultiness of the first, was it to be expected that a very balancing tone, in speaking of the Roman Church, should obtain among those who succeeded to the change? Is it consistent, we will not say with human nature, but proper earnestness, when a great class of evils is strongly brought before us, to keep up a perfectly cool equilibrium, to divide ourselves into exact halves, and entertain a precisely equal extent of indignation at them, on the one hand, to the watchfulness against that indignation on the other? Still more is it consistent with common sense that those who wish to impress those evils upon others should be particular to pair them with the good points in the same system, and intersperse commendations, which to ordinary minds would only tend to neutralize their censures? Such is not the way in which either evil or good is done in the world: we are obliged practically to be more or less onesided; the mere fact of having one thing to do, this or that point to gain, and not another, makes us so. And such was the position and the aim of our divines who succeeded the Reformation; as their expressions elsewhere respecting the Church of Rome actually force us, in vindication of their consistency, to suppose; for they admit, when they come to argue with the Puritans, very many things on the other side. In another point of view their language may be said to have *a more wholesale, whole-length, general* character, than the Oxford writers are willing to adopt; but such *wholesale* general language is, in fact, only the *exclusive* or *partial* one we have just mentioned in another form; for when *all that you notice* is bad, the mind of the reader naturally leaps to the inference that the *whole* is bad: and indeed such language is extremely apt, even in the writer himself, to shade off into the wholesale, because the single view that he is obliged to direct to *one part* of the system, tends to make him identify it with *the whole.* He has *one* object before him, and not *another;* he feels strongly certain evils, wishes to expose them, and does not concern himself with what there may or may not be of good in spite of them. The parting view which the nation had had of the Roman Church, left, and justly and deservedly so, a very unfavourable image of her deeply marked upon the national mind, and that image produced its natural results in the writings of our divines.

If we turn to that element in the *fons malorum* which may be called the *political* one, we shall find these reasons acting, and

acting with a double force. The usurpations and extortions of the Court of Rome in this country, especially in the period antecedent to the Reformation, are simple matter of history, acknowledged even by Roman Catholics themselves; and coming as they did from that Court in her worst state of corruption, when she chose the most licentious Popes, and tolerated the lowest standard of morals in her ecclesiastics, both high and low, they raised that indignant feeling which must ever attach to undeserved power and success, which, sometimes right and sometimes wrong, is as powerful as any feeling that we possess. A severe and holy priesthood does, upon natural principles, rise to be the first power in the world; but take away its severity, and its strength is gone. Human nature kicks against the claims of a Borgia or a Leo X. The English monarchy took advantage of the reaction of feeling which these and other causes had produced against the papacy to throw off its yoke. The nation, relieved from a large class of grievances and irritations, which had been long a source of agitation and ill blood, retained at the same time a lively recollection of them: they figured conspicuously in the controversy between the two Churches which ensued after the Reformation, and, as might be expected, contributed a good deal to the peculiarly angry hue of that controversy. It is striking, however, formidably as these charges show upon the pages of our divines, how much force and weight they lose as signs of "Protestantism," when we see them in their true light, as having a *political* rather than a *religious*, and a *superficial* rather than a *fundamental* bearing against Rome; a great deal of it being little more than what Roman Catholic divines might say, and have said. The Protestant of this day comes naturally expecting to find the question decided on grand abstract grounds, such as our philosophical religionists now take; some deep and awful principle that grapples with the antagonist system in its very lowest depth and abyss; something that annihilates the Pope and all his metaphysical ancestry up to the remotest degree—the probable, the possible, the possible-in-idea pope—makes a clearance of them, chases them out of *rerum natura*. Instead, however, of a fundamental, irreconcileable objection to a visible head and first bishop of the Church, as such, he finds the most prominent exceptions ever resting against certain unsound forms and developments of the Roman primacy, certain abuses, certain corruptions, certain usurpations. Our divines are open-mouthed against the "exactions, extortions, encroachments upon civil rights of princes and their subjects, or upon the ecclesiastical rights of bishops, their provisions, pensions, and exemptions, and reservations, and dispensations, and inhibitions, and pardons, and indulgences; against their charges for confirma-

tions, elections, admissions, collations, provisions, presentations, holy orders, benedictions, investitures, bulls," &c.; against "their annates, tenths, first fruits, pall money;" "the great inconveniences and abuses attending the offices of their nuncios, the greatness of their fees." Page after page does Bramhall devote to bitter complaints on the subject of these grievances; he even descends to minute particulars: "the Archbishop of Mentz paid for his pall (worth about sixteen pence) thirty thousand florins:" "a rich clergyman could no sooner fall sick but the Pope's collectors were gaping about him for his goods, and guards set about his house;" and even "bishops had been deserted upon their death-beds, and famished for want of meat to eat: they had not, before they were dead, even a cup left to drink of, nor so much as a candlestick of all their goods, by which means creditors were defrauded, processes in law multiplied, and great estates wasted to nothing."

We have got then here two great practical classes of corruptions, from which the country was set free at the Reformation, the one religious, the other political, or political and ecclesiastical mixed; and have seen, that both of these led to a *general and wholesale* form of opposition and objections to the Roman Church, or to a condemnation of that Church apparently *in toto*. But there is all the difference in the world, be it observed, between objections of a *general* or *extensive*, and objections of a *fundamental* sort; the *former* need not necessarily go beyond the *working part, or the bad developments*, or unsound excrescences of a system or a Church; it may be serious, eager, indignant, vehement, and yet after all the bark of its hostility may be worse than its bite, and may leave the *substratum* and *vital parts* of that which it attacks untouched: the *latter* kind is deep and deadly, cutting into the very heart's core, and attacking the very existence of its opponent. And of the latter kind, do we say, are the objections of the modern Protestant world against the Roman Church, as compared with those of our divines; the language of the two may agree up to a certain point, as mere language; the warmth and vehemence, the rhetoric and the sarcasms, the long roll of abuses and corruptions that issue from the *general* objector, may appear exactly the same dialect as that of the *fundamental foe*, to a superficial eye, that cannot distinguish one line of censure from another, and regards all only as discharges from the one fountain head, the *magno de flumine* of Anti-Popery; but the agreement will be found to stop at a certain point, and the hollowness of the resemblance appear. Take Jackson, *e. g.* the fiercest perhaps of all our divines against Rome, who identifies, as the Quarterly Review says, Jesuitism with the Roman Church.—A Babylon, an An-

tichristian Church, says Jackson: a Babylon, an Antichristian Church, says our Protestant also. She does evil that good may come, says Jackson, and thinks it right to do so; she poisons, she assassinates, atrocious Church. And adds the other, how awfully superstitious also does this ambition make her—she declares she can change bread and wine into body and blood—a pause ensues, and Jackson and our Protestant part asunder. The same would have followed had the subject of Church authority turned up, and shown that the two parties had been taking a different ground all along. Or does a German philosophising Protestant, charmed with Bramhall's strong language against the monopoly of all power in the Church by the see of St. Peter, invite him to condemn at once the title of Visible Head of the Church, as an Antichristian assumption of Christ's mediatorial office: Bramhall replies, that he has no such objection to the title, and that he would willingly use it for the sake of unity. Or is he pressed to condemn the notion of a *universal bishop*—he refuses to do it in the abstract—no, not even in its obnoxious sense of universal *jurisdiction:* he merely replies, it is "a *controverted*" point. In this way would our Protestants find themselves baulked in their advances to our divines, and knocking their heads perpetually upon hard corners, just when the agreement seemed to be completing; the endeavour on their part being, to reduce the controversy to *principle*, the tendency of our divines being to break it up into *details*. The cry now is for some grand theory of Christianity, some broad basis on which to plant our hostility to Rome; we are to unite, Calvinists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, all sects and parties of the Protestant name, upon the ground of Rome's supposed *suppression of the mediatorial office of Christ in uniting man to his Maker, and transference of it to the Pope;* and the Protestant world is called upon to set up a centre of unity in *the negation of* a Pope, and to rally round and fight for his *negative holiness*, against his *positive* holiness.* The days of Pope and Antipope are to be revived, and the tiara to be placed on the head of this Pontifical Οὐδείς, this sovereign nullity. Behold him, say our negative religionists—fond advocates for the positive and the dogmatic acknowledge your error, turn and see the native majesty of his Papal Nothingness: mark how he overflows with non-entity—how he glows with a proud consciousness of non-existence. Such is the *grand negative* which is now erected into an idol, to be bowed down to and adored. The Papal theory, instead of being simply opposed and resisted, as it was by our divines, is now made use of for quite another purpose,

* See Mr. Maurice's Reply to Mr. Palmer.

for the sake of its *negative;* and this negative asserted to be the cardinal truth of Christianity, viz. the doctrine of the mediatorial office of Christ, which Protestants are for and Romanists against, and therefore, for it really comes to this, *against Christianity*:—this to be the grand and simple basis we are to take against Rome We hesitate not to say, that there is no precedent for such a ground to be found in our divines; some one or two, who have been contradicted over and over again by the rest, may have called Rome in a vague sense heretical, but nowhere has the controversy with her been reduced to one between Christianity and no Christianity; and all her best divines, *uno ore*, acknowledge the Roman to be a true Church. So far from there being any Church of England authority for such a ground; they who use it can only do it *themselves* upon the notion of *developing* her, they cannot pretend to say that she has gone so far as yet. She has, as contrasted to thus *systematizing* the contest, and reducing it to a simple fundamental question of *principle*, given it an especially *practical* tone, rested it upon a groundwork of particulars and details. It is not with her divines a contest of principle between *one religion and another*, but between various secondary practices and doctrines in *the same religion*. The practical working of the Roman system before the Reformation, is the great image before their minds, nor when they descend deeper, and go into the question of formal doctrine, do they omit to carry with them this practical medium through which to view it; and their censure falls in fact more upon the medium, than the doctrine seen through it. It is obvious how completely the controversy has, during the last century, been setting the other way. The popular doctrine of justification by faith has been reducing it more and more to one of *principle*, to a question of life and death between the Churches. That doctrine has grown stronger and stronger in making the *immediate* union of the *individual* with Christ essential to Christianity, and consequently condemning the *medium* of the Church as Antichristian, till at last it has developed, in philosophical form, the preposterous and absurd basis against Rome that we have noticed.

And now with the *old* ground of the controversy with Rome before us, as contrasted with the *modern*, we will simply put the question—are we *now* in the situation in which our old divines were? Are *we* lately relieved from the corruptions of Rome, and has Popery the dominant claim on our attention? *Can any one believe that if those divines were living now, they would not, with their high Catholic views of doctrine, find other subjects to write about than Popery? Is Popery our great enemy now?* Only look around—dissent is triumphant among us. Continental Protes-

tantism has developed into a mischievous system, compared with which the corruptions of Rome are as mere dust in the balance. An entirely different, and a much worse class of evils are threatening us, than those which the Reformation removed: the fault was *superstition* then, now it is *latitudinarianism, schism, and infidelity*. "The man who would cry Popery! Popery! now," says Dr. Johnson, "would have cried, Fire! Fire! at the deluge." The Quarterly Reviewer, however, thinks otherwise—he thinks that *Popery, and not dissent,* is the prevailing evil among us, and accordingly is resolved, whatever Dr. Johnson may say, to cry Popery, Popery, as lustily as he can. "*A battle,*" he says, "*is before us—a battle not so much against dissent, which is every day losing ground, as against Popery*"—by Popery not meaning tractarianism, the Popery "within the Church," as it is called, but the genuine system so called. He thinks that *Popery and superstition are the great and absorbing dangers of the nineteenth century!* in comparison of which we have nothing at all to fear from dissent! And that, with the plain fact before his eyes, and everybody's eyes, that the Roman Catholics can only scrape up a convert here and there, whereas the whole country, especially the manufacturing part, is flooded with dissent? The blindness which can make such statements in defiance of such facts is, we confess, hardly intelligible; but it proves how necessarily his view of imposing the controversial language of one age upon another and a different one, leads him to overlook and misrepresent the actual state of things around us. If it be said that there were contrary evils to those of Popery in those days also, and that the counterbalance of Puritanism gave our divines the proper *via media,* which would make their language suitable to our times, we answer, that there certainly was a Puritan as well as a Roman Catholic side in those days, and so much the worse for the latter. Our divines could not make a single admission in their favour, without bringing down the whole Puritan party, like a hornets' nest, upon themselves; and so the balance, if there was one, told decidedly the other way. An enemy, and a strong one, as the Puritan was, if he had to be *opposed,* had at the same time to be *conceded to;* though not to the sacrifice of principle, still so far as to exercise considerable caution upon those subjects on which the sympathies of the nation were with him.

We declare ourselves then ready any moment, if called on, to express the greatest horror at the sale of indulgences, image worship, and other superstitious practices that Rome has encouraged, but we should think it very foolish and very superfluous to be spending our time in such attacks, when other foes are overrunning us. Every one must allow that it is at any rate

some time now since we had them in this country, and the memory cannot keep up its freshness for ever; the picture on the imagination will lose some of its vividness in the course of three centuries. Our faces cannot turn pale now, or our hair stand on end, because we read in histories of such bad doings among us before *the reign of Henry VIII.* And the long roll of political grievances once endured from the Roman See—are we to have an equally fresh recollection of *them* too? —to represent our feelings as still smarting from the insolence of the Pope's nuncios, and our pockets as only just recovered from the extortions of his tax-gatherers, and the heavy imposition of his Annates and Peter's-pence? Is, on the first mention of Rome, our honest indignation to rush forth in a torrent of bitter complaints against her "provisions, pensions, reservations, exemptions, dispensations, inhibitions, charges for confirmation, elections, admissions, collations, provisions, presentations," &c. &c. For our own part we cannot help thinking that the weapons of controversial, as those of military warfare, are somewhat changed since the days of our ancestors, and the attempt to force upon us the contents of the old armoury, makes us almost sympathize with the afflicted feelings of the brave Captain Dalgetty —"Bows and arrows!—Have we Robin Hood and Little John back again? Bows and arrows! Why the sight has not been seen in civilized war for a hundred years. My service to you, addressing a mountaineer who offered him a bow, Dugald Dalgetty may say of himself, as he learned at Mareschal College,

> "Non eget Mauri jaculis, neque arcu,
> Nec venenatis gravida sagittis,
> Fusce, pharetra."

But whatever may be the individual predilections of our reviewer, we do not charge the mass of our opponents with any such intention as this. They do not wish to take us back to the old ground of the controversy—far from it—their's is a *forward*, not a *retrograde* movement—not a *fixing*, but a *developing* of the Church, *in their line of doctrine.* They cannot but know, that the same language used when Popery was lately recovered from and was the official subject of controversy, is quite another language used at a *later* era, which has another dominant subject; and argues a different religious character and view in the users of it. The modern divine who thinks Popery the great and exclusive object of attack, shows thereby an obtusity and indifference to the *real* evils which surround us, which proves him no sound churchman. *Transplant a real churchman out of the seventeenth century, and he will attack, we will venture our life upon it, not our Popery, but our latitudinarianism.* Those who remove a language out

of its natural sphere, *give it their own meaning, make it their own —it is their language thenceforth, not really that of its original holders.* Our opponents have departed widely from the original grounds against Rome. They and the original holders of this language differ *toto cælo* on the most fundamental points, and therefore *cannot*—churchmen and *no* churchmen—*cannot* oppose Rome upon the same ground: it is a contradiction to suppose it. *We are not going to assist our opponents in thus departing from our divines, and developing the English Church, through the medium of the war with Rome, into continental Protestantism.*

But the departure of the modern controversy against Rome from the ancient ground, will appear better when we consider the *positive,* as well as the *negative,* position of our divines, i. e. in addition to their peculiar state of collision with Rome, the *peculiar ties* they were under to an *existing system*—ties which must be taken into account in forming a just conception of their whole defence of the Regal, against the Papal power. They denied the *jus divinum* of the latter power, they opposed its historical claims over this country and Church; they assailed it roundly, but they did so as much *pro Rege,* as *contra* Papam. It is the king, the king, the king from first to last; the king whose privileges the Popes had so attacked and impaired. Certain powers are asserted to belong to the king, to be his by right of property, to have been his from time immemorial. The Pope, in claiming them claimed, what as a matter of fact was not his own; it was a question of ownership; the property belonged to one, and therefore could not belong to another: it was a dispute between two parties, the king was in possession of the field, and therefore the Pope must withdraw. It was not that the latter was excluded *in the nature of things:* our divines did not deal, as we have observed, in such *large views,* and such *abstract theoretical grounds;* they took a more practical, some will say, a more superficial, view of the subject. They argued from history, they looked to the particular constitution, ecclesiastical and civil, under which they lived; and their inquiries terminated in a view highly favourable to the claims of our English kings, as opposed to those of the Roman court: lastly, which is the observation we began with, they lived in a new political era, which, while it had developed most surprisingly the civil powers of the monarchy, had also given it a new relation to the Church, exhibiting it, or giving it the opportunity of exhibiting itself, in a more sacred and amiable light than any it had yet appeared in.

The great events of the Reformation placed our monarchs, we do not say in the strict and legal sense, but practically in a great deal of that relation to the Church which had belonged to the Pope; they

obtained the supremacy—a position which, *once established*, (we say nothing about the step by which it was originally gained,) the Church was certainly bound to respect, and if well and conscientiously used, to be grateful for such use of it. Nor is it any more than justice to our sovereigns who succeeded to this power, to say that, making allowance for the disadvantages of their secular station, they did use it on the whole for the support of the Church against a succession of most bitter and malignant opponents—Queen Elizabeth upon a mixed ground, partly of interest, partly of early Church prejudices; the Stuarts almost solely on the religious ground. With the power of Erastianizing the Church in its hands, the monarchy raised its tone, and encouraged its spiritual pretensions; it appeared, we scruple not to say, in a more amiable and engaging character than it had been seen in since the days of Edward the Confessor. The Church felt its protection, and was grateful for it; and a poetical image of the royalty was the result, which sunk deep in the minds of the best and noblest of that age, and our divines among the number. They carried about an exalted and refined image of royalty in their hearts, to which they showed as tender a devotion, as ever knight errant did to the miniature of his lady. A kind of emulation arose which could give it most, and say most for it; the theory of divine right mounted to an almost dizzy height, and history was ransacked to defend all the positions, both ecclesiastical and civil, which the king occupied.

This, we are confident, is no over-statement of the truth, nor will it appear such to any who are acquainted with the era of which we are speaking. No revolution, bloody or bloodless, had happened then to break the full reflection of the splendours which a long and heroic line of kings had shed upon the monarchy. We say *heroic;* they will not bear examining according to another standard, but heroes they certainly were, if any of that order there have been since the battles of the giants, or the siege of Troy. To the reader of history they seem to rise up from the ground, one after another, like the Spartæ of old, armed cap-à-pie, full grown kings, and kingly minds at starting. They were men of splendid talents and undaunted spirit, warriors and statesmen in an almost equal degree, combining political depth and sagacity, with all the chivalry which, in those days, qualified the general and military man, and answering perhaps more than any line of kings, legendary or historical, the Roman excepted, and perhaps as much as they, the Homeric standard of heroism, "being great in the council and in the fight." These qualities, descending, as they did, in such remarkable succession from one to another in the line, formed at last a kind of halo around the

monarch, and acted, as by a spell, upon the national mind. Pride in their kings become a kind of instinct with Englishmen—all the feeling which the Scripture attributes to the Israelites—"Nay, but we will have a king over us—that he may judge us, *and go out before us and fight our battles,*" had penetrated them; the regale benefited by it, and reign after reign its impetus grew, till at last Henry VIII., in sheer insolence and the mere whim of *doing*, because he *could* do, put his foot on the neck of the English nation. The Stuarts succeeded, apparently, though not with such a substratum as the event proved, to all the power of the Lancasters and the Tudors, and united to it the religious and Church position that we have mentioned; a union which heightened the interest already attaching to the monarchy, by allying it with another, and quite a fresh, class of sympathies.

In this state of things then our divines wrote, nor is it to be denied that "they spoke well of the bridge that they got well over;" more than that, they did not do so merely as a duty, but with all their heart and soul, as gratitude impelled them. They defended the royal supremacy zealously against both Papists and Puritans, and were necessarily led, in doing so, into a perpetual recurrence to the whole series of corruptions and usurpations which had contributed to its establishment. But is it to be pretended that the present form of the controversy against the Roman power is at all a representation of this original? Is it the rights of Queen Victoria that the orators of the Reformation Society are standing up for? Are they giving vent to their feelings of loyalty, or discharging their zeal for the divine right of kings? Not they—they care about as much for the divine right of kings, as they do for that of popes—and their line is simply a *negative* one against the latter; and against it upon grounds that would destroy, if pressed to their extent, all ecclesiastical power whatever, and if destructive to the Bishop of Rome, ought to cause some alarm to his Grace of Canterbury as well. Is this *barren, negative line, this mere hostility to Rome and nothing else,* to be at all compared with the feeling, and the zeal of our old divines for their princes, and against Rome so far as it interfered with them? We do not mean to say of course that had they lived under other circumstances, and another form of government, they would have tolerated all Rome's pretensions; whether they would or not, is not a question here; we simply say that their feeling against the Roman power was, as a matter of fact, a mixed one, *positive for the Prince, not negative merely against the Pope;* and that their language against Rome must be regarded in this light, and understood with this association.

However, we can imagine some of our opponents offended at

having their loyalty disputed, and declaring themselves ready to hold all the language, and entertain all the feelings towards the present monarchy, that our divines had toward theirs, and challenging us to do the same. The State, they may say, stands in the same relation to the Church that it did in their time, and therefore we do not see why the same ecclesiastical powers should not be conceded, and the same deference paid to it in ecclesiastical things. Such is the opinion of the Quarterly Reviewer, who tells us, that *the Church is not now in a worse position with respect to the State than it was in the days of Whitgift, Hooker and their successors.**

Now, with all deference to the respectable quarter from which this assertion proceeds, we cannot call it any thing else than a palpable and egregious mistake as to a simple matter of fact. The Church *is* in a very different and in a much lower position, with respect to the State, than it was in the times of these divines. Then it was *coextensive and identical* (in respect of those who composed it) with the State: when men ceased to be members of the former, they were also deprived of their position in the latter: a seceder from the Church was, as such, a criminal and a malefactor. The King, the Council, and the Parliament, were all not only necessarily Churchmen, in common with the rest of the nation, but Churchmen bound officially to protect the Church and put down her enemies; and therefore whatever powers were exercised then by and in the State over the Church were exercised by Churchmen. Parliament was an ecclesiastical assembly in one sense, and the Church was legislated for by her own members and her sons. The theory of the identity of Church and State was all-powerful, and was the basis of the whole constitution.

We put it then to any person as a simple question of fact, Is or is not this order of things reversed? Are persons now obliged to go to Church in order to escape going to jail? Are even ministers, privy councillors, members of parliament, magistrates, or any class of civil functionaries, obliged to be Churchmen? Is the theory of the identity of Church and State in any sense or shadow of sense preserved? Or is it not rather the favourite and the avowed principle of modern statesmen to regard the Church as one sect amongst many, and therefore not to tolerate only, but patronize and extend the State bounty equally to dissenters? Has parliament, consisting as it does now of every denomination of religionists, the same claim to legislate for the Church that it had

* "The Church of England is not now in a worse position with respect to the State, than when Whitgift was compelled to remonstrate with Queen Elizabeth against sacrilege," &c.

when it was an exclusive assembly of Churchmen? If not—if all these things have altered, what can the Quarterly Reviewer mean by asserting that the Church stands in the same position to the State that it did two hundred years ago? Such a statement can do nothing but show what unreal views and carelessness to fact the writer is driven to by the object he has before him.

The blunder, however, is not simply made, but pursued and argued on; and we are glad, by the way, of this opportunity of meeting the charge founded upon it; the "Oxford writers" being charged with most grave and formal error because they do not make the same themselves. They are charged with disloyalty, with being "*unversed in ecclesiastical history*," and the like. We should like to know what page of "ecclesiastical history" the Reviewer refers to, which bids us admit with satisfaction and deference the interference of a Civil Power shared by Independents, Quakers, and Socinians, in the government of the Church. To take his instance—"Persons unversed in ecclesiastical history" are charged with actually hesitating at the doctrine that "*the King hath power, if he shall see cause, to suspend any bishop from the execution of his office*"!—an opinion which he attempts to father upon Sanderson. Now we certainly can imagine cases where it might be the duty of a pious king, acting according to the wish and intention of the Church, to depose an immoral or heretical bishop; but to lay down the general principle that any king may suspend any bishop, sounds really like the most intolerable Erastianism. The Reviewer may profess to use such language as "speaking only of the *external** exercise of the episcopal office," but we say it ought not to be used at all; *that the king* "*may deprive a bishop utterly of his dignity and office*," is plainly Erastian language, if there is any force in language; and the best qualification of it would be its simple and absolute withdrawal. Nor does the writer appreciate properly the state of ecclesiastical feeling within the Church, if he supposes that such sentiments can be applauded, or even escape censure. Our divines certainly allowed their kings to do many things, *acting according to the wish and intention of the Church*, as the latter did in that age. But this is an important qualification, and if any one applies their concessions, made to kings whom they revered, and who they knew would use them *ecclesiastically*, into universal propositions applicable without exception to all times and circumstances, true of heathen, or heretical or latitudinarian, as well as

* "It is not the power of the Keys," says Bramhall, "or any part or branch thereof, in the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, *even in the exterior court of the Church*, which is derived from the Crown, but only the coercive and compulsory power."—Old Ed., p. 191.

of Christian, Catholic, or loving rulers; he makes, we will not say *them*, but *himself*, Erastian. For our own part we feel it impossible, for the plain reasons just given, to regard the civil power in the same light in which our divines regarded it; it is not a question of taste or bias, but of fact—the state of things is different and therefore we must feel differently.

The application is easy and obvious—a deep feeling, a fundamental theory, which formed a main ingredient in the old controversy with the Papacy, is extinct; it has no longer a place in our system; and, therefore, that controversy *is not and cannot be* now what it was, it *does not and cannot represent* the genuine original. The question is, whether the *basis of feeling* is the same or not; if it is not, you may represent the past, it is true, in a sense, but it is just as a magpie may represent a man, or as the embalmer may imitate life. The spirit, the tone, of the contest is gone; and the use of the same language, so far from representing, becomes a virtual *misrepresentation* of the original holders of it. What does it signify that a writer can string together a hundred or a thousand extracts of this sort, provided we prove that he does not, and that *he cannot possibly* appropriate them in the *spirit* which dictated them? It is not to place ourselves in opposition to our divines, to refuse to join in so spurious a representative of the old controversy.

So much for the language of our divines against the doctrine and jurisdiction of the Roman Church. On both these heads, it appears that our Church stood in a *peculiar position* after the Reformation, a position which forced her into taking a one-sided, or exclusively unfavourable view of her, into seeing only her corruption on the one head, her ambition on the other. The great corruptions which preceded the Reformation left our divines, in whose memory they were fresh, the task of their exposure, and this, and their obligations to the monarchy together, made them speak of their delivery from them in a language often, which they would not have adopted in this nineteenth century, in which they would have found such a different class of evils to oppose, and such a different civil power to defend.

This excuse, however, of a "*peculiar position*," we hear our opponents say, shall not serve you. The fact is, that you do not use the language of our divines, and therefore you acknowledge them to be against you, and that is the beginning and the end of the matter. Now this mode of stating the case may be logical and fair, but it can only be so on the ground that all explanations are *ipso facto* inadmissible and invalid. Those who admit that there may be such a thing as an explanation, are bound to attend to one, when offered them, if they have

the capacity. And we appeal to those who acknowledge this premise, and who have this capacity, whether it is not a simple common sense, recognised and obvious truth, that persons' views are very much influenced by circumstances and position? For our own part we know of no maxim that is more generally received, and more *in ore omnium*, than this. And this granted, was or was not the age that succeeded the Reformation a peculiar one, one in which a strong reaction had taken place against an old religious system, a reaction that appealed to real grounds of corruption in its defence, and which was therefore all the stronger in its consciousness of strength? And are reactions, especially strong ones, favourable for producing an equilibrium of mind and a balanced judgment? Is it not admitted, that persons when they have *one* object before them, often state a question, pursue an argument, round a climax, more strongly than if they had another? Do not persons constantly say things that are true for the object, in the place, at the time, to the person, &c. which it would yet be obviously unfair to transfer from their context, and make naked abstract propositions of? How often do persons express themselves in the universal form—always, never, absolutely, and the like—when they only mean to say, now, then, for us, &c. There is such a thing surely as what may be called *practical*, in contrast to architypal, logical truth; nay, is not the former the guide we are most conversant with; can men, even when they want to state the latter kind of truth, even when they meet and compare terms and measure clauses with the scientific view of doing so, succeed always? And if so, can it be expected from any set of popular writers, who wrote professedly for their own times? They could not well help, in such a reaction, going further than they would have done had there not been such a reaction; and it is only fair to qualify their language accordingly, limiting it *by* its circumstances, instead of taking it *out of* them. We ought not to take their writings as if they came from the moon. They were controversialists *against* Rome, and wrote almost every thing in that capacity. What a pregnant fact is this even barely stated. Do controversialists write to compliment their opponents, or not rather *professedly* to find fault; of the two sides of a system, the *pros* and the *cons*, does not their very office confine them to the latter? Look at the whole state of things again that we have noticed, the peculiar union of Church and King, which had the claim of established order upon our divines, and the still stronger one of the interests of the Church were then absolutely dependent upon it against the attacks of the Puritans; how *could* such an union be defended (and defend it they must, their fears as churchmen and

loyalty as subjects obliged them)—how could it be defended but by that which detracted from Rome. The legitimacy of the former depended upon the argument against the latter. And this argument had of course a double keenness and force given to it by the enormous pretensions of the Roman Court to temporal power over kings, which put every loyal subject upon his metal. From this whole position flowed, as a matter of course, certain language about Rome on the one hand, and the Reformation and the Reformers on the other, which is appealed to now triumphantly—as if such language was not necessary, as if any other could have been held. Given the relation of Church and State and the whole order of things then established, and a multitude of details follow as a matter of course, if such order is to be maintained. One leading position ramifies into a hundred different shoots, but to point to each one of these as so many separate independent testimonies to the "Protestantism" of our divines—to convert the praise of the "blessed" Reformation, and of the Jewels, and the Cranmers, and the Latimers, one after another, into so many fresh blows to the "Oxford writers," is something like the schoolmaster's equity who hits a boy for a false quantity, and then hits him again and again, as often as it occurs in the exercise, forgetting that the original mistake implies its own repetition, and does not become a fresh one each time.

Such is the omnipotence of a *state of things* once established. Of course we do not mean to say that our divines wrote merely with the object of defending it, and not what they really *felt:* they felt what they said, but, we say, such a *state of things marked out such feelings and prepossessions* for them; made them feel in favour of particular events and particular persons, which *feelings* therefore are to be taken in connexion with, and as qualified by, the *state of things* which nourished them. The fact is, all persons who speak or act, speak or act under certain circumstances, and those circumstances are an integral part of the character of such acts and of such opinions, and cannot be properly appreciated apart from them. And although no author *says*—I think so and so because I have such and such influences acting on me;—if, as *a matter of fact*, he had those influences, the reader may as certainly give him the benefit of them as if he had taken it himself. This is only the ordinary distinction in fact that we draw between *opinion* and ἦθος, or between a man's *real* opinions and his *formal* ones, or between *himself* and his opinions, or between what he *does* think, and what he *would* have thought if &c.; distinctions which imply a kind of outer and inner man, and a power in us of separating the two, but which, so far from being considered refinements and subtleties, are among the commonest

remarks we make. And therefore, with respect to our divines, the turning question is, had they a Church *spirit*, did they hold Church *doctrines?* If they did, they belong to us, and not to our opponents. Their controversial language should be interpreted by their religious spirit, not their religious spirit by their controversial language.

Only consider the number of cases of the most expressed and declared opinions where we allow ourselves this liberty. Take, *e.g.*, what has been said against the "voluntary principle" of late years. How strong, how general, how absolute the opinions against it; if taken literally, they amount to an abstract and unqualified condemnation of the principle, and might easily be cast in our teeth, supposing the desertion of the state compelled our Church at any future time to have recourse to it.—Take the language again of our Tories, even high Tories, since the revolution of 1688; how completely do their eulogies of that event give up the *jus divinum* of kings and the whole Tory theory, and yet many and many such eulogists we believe to have been genuine old Tories *at heart*. Or take the strong declarations of the same party on the other hand against political reform, which apparently upheld the boroughmongering system *in the abstract*. Their leader said positively and *ex cathedrâ* that "no reform was wanted," of course meaning no reform that we should get in the place of the old system; reform would *now*, with such and such influences afloat, in the hands of such and such parties, be a bad thing. But a future historian may take the announcement in its abstract and literal sense, and enlarge upon the bigotry of it.—Or to go to theology. How decidedly the Fathers speak of actual external unity being *essential* to the Church. They lived in times of unbroken unity, and did not foresee or provide for a divided state of Christendom. Or how might some again, who wrote against pagan idolatry, be understood as imposing the whole of the Jewish law against pictures or representations of any kind in churches? Jerome writes in such a way that he is appealed to by Presbyterians against episcopacy. What makes him write so?—an intention not to lower the episcopacy, but to exalt the priesthood.

In the same way the modern Protestant appeals to the language of our divines to justify his constant declamations against Rome, and we answer, was there not a cause—a cause for their use of it which there is not for yours. There *was*—there was a whole state of things in which they lived, and under which they acted, and through which they wrought, and out of which they produced, and on which they and the Church stood and maintained themselves—a state of things which was for the time their means, their material, their basis, their sphere. That state of things is passed.

Papal corruption *was* the official subject of *that* day, it is not of *this:* the high theory of Church and King, which threw such life into *their* opposition to Rome, is now obsolete. That state of things is passed—the Church has entered on another era, and may alter its language accordingly. Nor can we doubt that our divines would have been the first to set the example. We know for certain their religious spirit and their doctrines, and that gives us all we want. Were they living now, they would soon single out other lines of controversy than those, which would unite them with principles that they detested, and with a party whose predecessors they ejected from the Church.

Indeed the truth is, *they have set the example already*—a change *has* taken place in the language of the Church on this very subject, connected with a general rise of ecclesiastical feeling within her: *the precedent is already set,* and is a safe and an authorized one, if we are to trust the reviewer's character of the divines who set it. And this brings us to our other head, viz. *the internal progress and formation* of our Standard Divinity.

II. We have hitherto viewed our divines *en masse,* as the Quarterly reviewer alone sees them, and only attempted to supply his unmeaning group with an historical scene and foreground; but the following brief sketch, substantiated as it will be by extracts from many of those writers, will, we hope, show that a considerable difference existed amongst *themselves* on these very subjects, and that the Church, as she receded from the era of the Reformation, adopted a much more moderate and conciliatory tone towards Rome. It will also meet the two other principal charges which are brought against the "Oxford movement," charges we may take upon ourselves gladly to admit, as, in our humble opinion, they reflect more discredit upon the accusers than the accused, viz. its jealousy of State interference, and its desire to revive Church ceremonies.

We are far from denying then, since our opponents will insist upon our asserting it, that the Reformation introduced a great mass of bad unecclesiastical opinion into the Church, both on these and on doctrinal subjects. Our Reformers, as we said in our last number, were not Puritans or Sectarians *themselves,* but they *let in* Puritanism and Sectarianism to a most fearful extent. We doubt not that, had they dared, they would have given it more resistance than they did; but they went with the State, and the State was anxious for the Church lands. Somerset and the aristocracy pressed upon them from above; a powerful religious party then in the very infancy of life and strength, Lollards, Hussites, Wickliffites, embryo Puritans, Brownists, Independents, were pressing upon them from below; a party that they

had the more difficulty in resisting, because they only half disagreed with them, or rather did not know how far to agree, and how far disagree. Cranmer was more of a politician than a theologian; the very consciousness of the weakness of his own creed made him hesitate, he receded from one point of doctrine to another, and he and his associates at last submitted to the fate of all secondary and inferior minds who come into contact with superior ones—they were obliged to bow to the master-mind of Calvin, backed by the whole movement party in this country, over which he virtually presided, and with which, by the residence of Bucer and Peter Martyr and others of his school, as well as by his own letters, he kept up a constant communication. The new doctrines, thus weakly stemmed, rushed in like a flood, and our Reformers, at parting, left the Church in the hands of a Calvinist party, who were more really our reformers than they were themselves; only bequeathing, as a record of their own particular influence, a legacy of Erastianism. Cranmer and several of his colleagues took out their episcopal commissions in the king's name, they sanctioned the law which made all episcopal citations run in the king's name, and in short entirely handed over the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the state. The responsibility of these steps rests especially with them; they were only Zwinglians or Calvinists in obedience to others; they were Erastian of themselves.

But the compliance with the foreigners was of these two dangers far the most formidable; indeed, so far as we can judge by signs or appearances, it would probably, before long, if the death of Edward VI. had not intervened, have swamped the English Church in one general alliance with continental Calvinism. Cranmer, for the last two or three years of Edward's reign, corresponded with Calvin with that view; and the revisal of the Prayer-Book, made in consequence of his objections, is a standing memorial of his weight and influence here, and necessarily suggests the idea, that had Edward lived, a second revisal would probably have cleared our services even of those *tolerabiles ineptiæ* which the first, somewhat to his displeasure, allowed to remain. The Quarterly reviewer indeed makes a show of denying the foreign influence upon our Reformers, but the fact is too notorious to be disputed. Heylin indeed is quoted as saying that Calvin's offer of interference was on one occasion rejected by Cranmer. Be that as it may, however, Heylin himself declares, *totidem verbis*, that the alterations of the Second Prayer-Book were owing to the interference of "that *polypragmon*." The foreign influence, as we have already implied, did not arrive at its height *all at once*, but gradually. But that it did become very

great at last, is, we assert, notorious; that Cranmer brought leading foreigners to live here; that he gave Peter Martyr and Bucer the divinity chairs at Oxford and Cambridge; that he engaged deeply in correspondence with Calvin, and made the alterations in the Second Book out of deference to him and his school,—all this, we say, is historical matter of fact: if any ingenious critic doubts, we cannot help it, any more than if he proceeded to doubt that the Goths sacked Rome, or that the Normans under William the Conqueror gained possession of England.

And now for the results that naturally followed from this influence—the first and most sensible ones appeared in the desolation and profanation of our churches, the destruction of their ornaments, the promiscuous and wholesale overthrow of images and altars, the inextinguishable hatred that was manifested to all the splendours, the formalities, and very commonly even the decencies of public service, whether the act of kneeling, or bowing the head, or the sacerdotal vestment, or the sign of the cross,—in that complete hostility, in short, to all *externals*, which has been the especial badge of Calvinism. We do not say that all who took part in, or were driven on by, the movement, went all these lengths, but this was its tendency and character as a whole. It should never be forgotten that it was not the chauntry altars named after the Virgin, or after the Saints (*those* had been removed long before), but the altar of God, standing in the place where it now stands at the east end of the church—that altar it was which Ridley, by his famous order, pulled down, and removed, in the form of a communion table, into *the middle of the church*. The order was followed in his own diocese, and more or less in most; and of course turned our churches, as much as any outward arrangement could turn them, into *conventicles*. Even to this day the rubric, which allows the communion table (even at communion time) to stand in the "the body of the church," is a memorial of the sectarian spirit of our Reformation; while at the same time its practical obsoleteness shows that we have allowed ourselves in a considerable departure from that spirit; and that the Church, while retaining the Reformation formulary, has virtually risen above it. We only wish that those who would be ashamed of recurring to such an arrangement (as surely every good churchman now would), would cease to applaud so unhesitatingly the authors of it.

Or to turn to another and formerly much agitated subject, who cannot see in the Reformers the first introducers, though not the originators, of the old Puritan feeling against ecclesiastical vestments? They retained indeed a great number in the first book, but then came in foreign influence, and all disappeared except the surplice

for the priest, and the rochet for the bishop. Nor did they stand out properly and on principle even for what they retained; for they made Hooper a bishop, who refused to wear them. True it is, they contested the point, and at last brought him to a compromise that he should wear them on certain particular occasions, and be excused the rest. But why pick out such a man at all? Why persist in making an obstinate Puritan, a mere dogged Genevan preacher, of all things in the world, a bishop, and persisting in it against his will, sending him to jail, obliging him to take the episcopate *vi et armis?* The selection of such a man, and the compromise with him, seem equally unworthy of persons who really meant to make a stand for the great principle of external worship. Nor can we fail to draw the inference that the agreement half-way between such defenders of the principle and their opponents, would very soon have ended in the former giving way altogether. Coverdale was another bishop of this sort—a thorough Puritan and Genevan; who officiated at the consecration of Archbishop Parker in *his black gown.* The very connexion with such men shows an indifference to the question. The same remark may be made on Ridley's answer to the exiles at Frankfort, who wrote to ask his advice, among other points, with respect to retaining the surplice in their change of situation. There seems no reason why they should not have done it; the authorities of the place showed no disposition to interfere; nothing appeared to prevent them; nor can one divine any reason why Ridley should so coolly and briefly recommend a discontinuance of it, except that he thought it a matter of indifference, upon which the exiles had better not run the risk of offending their continental brethren.

The immediate successors, however, of the Reformers, as often happens in such cases, went further than their predecessors did, and were more deeply imbued with the feeling of the day. The episcopate in the first part of Queen Elizabeth's reign were successors of Hooper and Coverdale, almost more than they were of Cranmer and Ridley; indeed, it was only her strong Tudor arm that kept them within decent bounds. The greater part of them positively objected to the surplice, including Sandys, Grindall, Pilkington, Jewell, Horn, Parkhurst, Bentham, and all the leading men, who were for simplifying our Church ceremonial in that and other respects according to the Genevan model, Archbishop Parker almost standing alone with the queen in her determination to uphold the former. We need only refer to the extracts given from Jewel's Letters in a former number, to show, that at the very time he was bishop, and bound by his office to maintain the orders of the Church, he was

corresponding with the Calvinists abroad against it, and longing for a release from its formalities. It was no Roman Catholic ritual, we repeat, of which he thus expressed himself, but our own doubly-reformed Prayer-Book, the divine service as *now* performed. Let high-churchmen understand this, and then look up to Jewel as a model if they please, if they like going flat against their own principles; but we have taken care that they should know the state of the case. For our own part we must confess ourselves of the opinion, that a man who dislikes the surplice, and talks about the formalities of our service, is either a dissenter at heart, or very near one. We remember, in a Church reform pamphlet, one of that pamphlet-teeming epoch of 1830, the writer calmly but seriously put the question whether instead of the surplice, it would not be so much better for the clergyman to read the prayers "*in a neat frock coat.*" Now we presume there could be little doubt as to the scale of churchmanship we should affix to this author. He might be a very amiable, intelligent, and religious man, have all kinds of good qualities; but no one would dream of calling our advocate "of neat frock coats" a churchman. No, no, we should hear it said, this is too much of a good thing—we are not quite come down to a gentleman "in a neat frock coat." And yet we cannot, for the life of us, discern the vast distinction between his and Jewel's wish. The latter would probably have given us the Genevan gown, instead of the frock coat; but a gown was the ordinary dress of the clergy in those days, as indeed it has been almost within the memory of man, and was no vestment of the Church. We are far from denying that Jewel was a very religious man, and led a strict and self-denying life: we have nothing to say against him personally, but only against his opinions. A man who held his opinions in the present day certainly would not be considered a churchman, though he might make a most excellent Dissenter; nor is the case altered because it goes back two centuries. Mr. Hallam, in his quiet impartial way, gives Jewel his proper character when he says, that he was "*a Precisian or Puritan.*" That is all that we want to say of him, and all that Mr. Froude meant when he called him an "irreverent dissenter"—Dissenter and Puritan expressing about the same thing. He did not mean that Jewel was *more* irreverent than other Dissenters, but only that he held dissenting principles, and that the principles of dissent are irreverent. Probably had he been writing a history, instead of a letter to a friend, he would not have used the phrase at all, but contenting himself with Mr. Hallam's, have called him simply a Puritan.*

* Jewel in time *so far yielded to the queen's and the archbishop's authority*, as to enforce the surplice in his diocese; but there is no reason to think that his private senti-

But doctrine, as well as ritual and external religion, suffered from the influence which the Calvinistic school was allowed to gain: the whole Church, from one end to the other, was flooded with the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, absolute election, reprobation, and the rest of the five points. They gained possession of both Universities—they were the recognized doctrines of our divinity schools, it was thought heretical to doubt them. Oxford (how different, how incongenial with everybody's idea of the place now) was the very focus of Genevan influence, its doctors and professors were Calvinistic preachers, its colleges and halls were seminaries of Calvinism. Up to a considerable time after the Reformation, Heylin mentions only two names of mere private persons in that University, who expressed any public disagreement with that system. The exiles who came from Frankfort and Geneva at the death of Queen Mary, doubly imbued, from their intercourse with the Protestants there, with the Calvinistic tenets, were triumphant everywhere: the bishoprics, deaneries, stalls, canonries, and all the benefices in the Church, were monopolized by them: Queen Elizabeth would gladly have dispensed with their services; but only just come to the crown, she was more afraid of the Papists than the Puritans, who were yet in embryo, and not formed into a distinct party; and, moreover, there was no one else to give the places to: all the world were Calvinists. Heylin, trying to make out the best case he could for the Church, could only say, that as there were seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal when the apostacy was apparently universal; so there were doubtless secret believers in the true Church-doctrines even in these times, who, "though few in number, served for a good assurance that the Church still kept possession of her primitive truths, not utterly lost, though much endangered by such contrary doctrines as had of late been thrust upon her." The Articles of Lambeth, constructed by Whitgift and the Calvinist bishops and leading divines, virtually superseded the Thirty-Nine Articles in this country, and were formerly adopted by the Irish Church into its confession of faith.

The reader has now the main materials for a picture of the reformed Church, such as it was rapidly tending to when Edward died—Churches turned as much as possible into conventicles, the communion table in the centre of the building, the clergyman reading the service in a black Genevan gown, and the pulpit resounding with ultra-Calvinistic doctrines. This was the

ments altered. He had never thought, like many others of his school, such externals positively *Antichristian*, however *objectionable;* and, therefore, *while they were the law of the Church*, he was willing to enforce them.

state the Church would in all human probability have come to, had the Reformation been allowed to run its own lengths: under Cranmer's direction it held a continuous downward course, which there is no mistaking; nor did its actual condition for a long time fall so far short of it: the progress was stopped, but the impetus it had given went on. Queen Elizabeth could insist upon such and such externals, but she could not prevent the doctrinal development; and even the externals could not be adequately enforced among an unwilling clergy. The wretched state of the Church fabrics, the constant profanation of them, the disorderly behaviour of the congregations, the slovenly officiating of the minister, the prevailing contempt of all forms and decencies, in the house of God, are an ever-recurring theme with the better historians and divines of the age, as Bishop Andrewes. The whole picture, indeed, makes us appreciate the strong sentiment of Thorndike, that "*the tares of Puritanism were sown together with the grain of the Reformation in the Church of England,*"—*sown together with the grain*—a significant expression, which, if it means any thing at all, stamps the Reformation *itself*, not any mere influence, mind, that went side by side with it, but *the very Reformation itself*, as in a considerable degree *a Puritan movement*.

That from such disorder we were rescued in time to save our existence as a Church, and to develope into a sounder and more ecclesiastical state, must be ascribed to the divine power of the episcopacy still preserved among us. Queen Elizabeth, with her prejudices in favour of the old religion, was doubtless an instrument in the hand of God, for stopping the progress of the Reformation; but it is contrary to the idea of a Church to suppose, that it could be recovered by any force secular and external; by any but an impulse of heaven and from within. That impulse it had in the divine principle of the episcopate, which gradually brought it round. Archbishop Parker, in the very worst of times, was a firm upholder of the external worship of the Church; Whitgift, though a Calvinist, was the same: under Bancroft and Bishop Andrewes the Church rose to a higher consciousness of her independent existence, and divine claims: Bishops Bilson, Morton, Hall, Davenant, Usher, Buckridge, Carleton, Dean Field, Hooker, Jackson, and many others, though brought up under the Calvinistic influence, had worked themselves out of it so far as to hold the highest views of the sacraments and the powers of the Church, still holding more or less to what are called peculiarly Calvinistic doctrines. They were churchmen, and zealous defenders of the Church, but they retained the impress of their education. The atmosphere of concentrated Calvinism, which

succeeded the Reformation, necessarily affected even high and powerful minds that were brought up in it; "men of good affection to the Church in *government and forms of worship*," says Heylin, "were unawares seasoned with Calvin's principles *in point of doctrine*," and the over harsh and violent language they employ in their controversies with the Roman Catholics, is one effect of this: Calvinism has always taken a peculiar part in embittering the controversy with Rome. "*The perverse opposition of the Calvinists*," says the historian just quoted, "*made the Papists obstinate.*" And "*the Church of Rome inveighed against as the Whore of Babylon, or the Mother of Abominations; the Pope as publicly maintained to be Antichrist, as if it had been one of the chief Articles of the Christian Faith*," he gives as one of the immediate consequences of the spread of their doctrines. Will any of our readers admire such expressions as the following, or not rather think that Jackson, though held up by our reviewer as a proper example of controversial language, had better have abstained from calling the Pope "*Christ's greatest enemy*,"—"the *son of perdition*," and the Roman Church "*a witch, enchantress*"—"*making gain the measure of goodness*"—"*canonizing assassins*," "*worshipping damned villains, damned miscreants*"—"*unto which every Christian must not stick to sacrifice his soul, as an holocaust ever burning in that brimstone lake.*" Even the Jesuits might have been exposed without having their "*malignant apostacy*" personified into "*the beastliest sluttish shee-fool*," and "*a bottomless pit of hypocritical preposterous blasphemies;*" and themselves designated as "*caterpillars, locusts, choosing Beelzebub for their God, the brood of Antichrist, croaking frogs, cracklings of Lucifer's candle*," and calling upon us to "*look on their madness, and laugh our fill at their apish drunkenness.*" We confess we do not wish to revive this style of controversial writing, and had much rather hear the objections to the Church of Rome stated in the plain sober language of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and Mr. Newman: not that we imagine for a moment, that a deep divine like Jackson, really meant to unchurch the Church of Rome by it: he is attacking Jesuitism, and he chooses to identify the Church of Rome with the worst development of that system; but it is Jesuitism, and not the Church of Rome as such, which really receives his blows. In the same way Field, in a passage which the same writer holds out to our unqualified approval, pronounces the Roman to be an "*heretical* Church:" the reviewer, collecting these kind of epithets into a string, a page or two afterwards turns the word "Church" into "Popery." But with all respect, we must ask him to replace the word: Field did not say "Popery" was heretical, he said the "*Church*" was. Do you, or do you not

(if he will let us address him), agree with this assertion: if you do, you contradict the whole current of our standard theology, and your own clear admissions too; if you do not, *why do you call upon us to use a language which you yourself condemn.* However, we are quite willing that he should understand Field in this qualifying sense, as referring to a system—Popery—working within the Church, not to the Church herself, especially as this is just the right that we have been claiming for ourselves with respect to the language of our divines. And then the case will be, that the reviewer first calls upon us to use all the language of our divines against Rome *without* qualification, and then immediately *has to qualify it in order to make use of it himself.*

The truth is, however, that neither Field or Jackson are exactly fair samples of Church of England theology, though very good representatives of her before she got out of the Calvinistic atmosphere. The same may be said of Bilson, Davenant, Usher, and others, quoted on the same side, who had suffered from it. Indeed *a full half of the reviewer's catena is taken from the Calvinistic era of the Church;* which ought not to have been done, at any rate without mentioning the fact (if he was aware of it), or drawing some distinction between that and the sounder divinity which succeeded it.

So much for the Calvinistic days of our Church: she was however even then upon the move, and the movement proceeded—even her Calvinism, as we have seen, had departed from the *Continental* Calvinism which the Reformation had introduced in the first instance; it had divested itself of its deadly opposition to Church forms. The surplice, the representative, in a way, of the whole question, and the established service book, were no longer in danger from within the Church; for the most Calvinistic bishops now upheld them. These were *steps already gained;* it remained that the Calvinistic *creed* should be given up as well, and the sharp Calvinistic spirit which had presided in controversy should be superseded by milder and more Catholic views.

Such a rise of ecclesiastical tone in the Church which Bancroft and Andrewes had already commenced, was developed and established by the Laudian episcopate:—we say rise of ecclesiastical tone *generally,* for the movement which went on under them affected far more than the one point of our attitude towards Rome, which was in fact only one among many features which changed with a general change of feeling in the Church. They explained and enforced the rights, privileges, and divine authority of the Church, and her hierarchy, which Cranmer and his school had merged into a mere creation of the state. The power of the keys

was asserted; even the rich and noble felt the discipline of the Church though wielded by a mixed tribunal: bishops issued citations in their own name, and by their own apostolical authority; and Convocation continued to debate after parliament was dissolved. Charles, as a reverential son of the Church, encouraged her pretensions, and all went on under his sanction and authority. The elevation of the ecclesiastical power was seen and immediately noticed; the alarm spread that the Church was assuming all the arrogant airs of the Papacy; Bishop (then Dean) Cozens was accused to parliament of asserting that "the king had no more authority in matters ecclesiastical than the boy who rubbed his horses heels," and Sanderson wrote his "Episcopacy" to quiet the apprehensions of politicians and Puritans, by acknowledging that the king *had* an authority, and was by law supreme in causes ecclesiastical. Bramhall and Thorndike were both against retaining the Oath of Supremacy, though they had no conscientious scruple against taking it: and "Laud, I have no doubt," says Mr. Hallam, speaking of the Commission of Delegates, "*would have put an end to this badge of subordination to the crown.*" "It is certain," says Hume, and his sneer is deserving of attention, "that all those high-churchmen who were so industrious in bringing the laity's necks under the king's yoke, were *extremely fond of their own privileges and independency, and were desirous of exempting the mitre from all subjection to the crown.*" "Nor would Queen Elizabeth," adds the former writer, "have borne this assumption of the prelates as tamely as *Charles in his poor-spirited bigotry seems to have done.*"

But the improvement in church order, and the externals of religion, was still more remarkable. Laud carried out the views of his predecessors in favour of it to a much further extent; and pushed his restorations with an activity which quite outshone the *defensive* stand which Archbishops Parker and Whitgift had made. The cleanliness and repairs of the Church fabrics, a great proportion of which were still in a miserable state, were looked to in right earnest; the communion tables, which the obstinacy of a Calvinist clergy in many places still kept in the body of the church, were affixed again to the East end; candlesticks, plate, and ornamental tapestry found their way upon them; and the splendour of the altars in the royal and archiepiscopal chapels and elsewhere, elevated the hearts of Churchmen, and excited Puritan disgust to the utmost. Add to this painted windows, the figures of the saints restored which the Reformation had effaced, the music of the choir service improved, rich copes used in the celebration of the Eucharist, in the King's chapels, at Croydon, Lambeth, and in all cathedral churches; the altar ap-

proached with bowing, churches entered with a reverence to the altar, and the name of Jesus acknowledged by the scriptural form. These with many other ecclesiastical reforms produced quite an altered aspect in our Church; and they would have been followed up doubtless by still further changes, had the career of the great reformer not been interrupted: as it is, however, they procured for him the reputation of an undoubted Papist with the Puritans of his day, as they still do with those of our own.

And here we must be allowed a remark on our contemporary's mode of alluding to the humble attempts in the same direction, which the new religious movement has in various quarters produced. We are not at all surprised that the same writer, who has made the other charges that we have been noticing, should also think proper to express his contempt for the endeavours which have been made to revive the pious externals of our public service; and that he should talk of "*silly minds that dote on ceremonies*," and put the whole subject under the contemptuous head of so much "*bowing, and crossing, and turning to the east.*" We are not at all surprised, we say, that he should feel and express this contempt; in these enlightened days, every one thinks himself perfectly safe in sneering at *forms;* but that he should attempt *to justify such a sneer by an appeal to our standard divines,* is indeed a piece of marvellous boldness that we were not prepared for. All our Church divines of all schools (we do not call the Hoopers and the Coverdales Church divines) have defended and insisted upon church ceremonial: a more unfortunate appeal could not have been made to them, for it was just one of *the* subjects which called forth their highest energy and feeling. "*Silly doting minds*" they may have been, but the fact is undeniable that they were sticklers for forms; nay, that they advocated literally a great deal of that "bowing and crossing, and turning to the east," which is thought so beneath the notice of reasonable beings; and further, which is still more important, that they did so *against the state of public opinion* in their day, which was "*both startled and offended*" at them. Let the modern religionist declare himself as strongly as he pleases against "*so called ancient novelties of dress and gesture,*" but let him, in common honesty, confess that he does so in the teeth of our standard divinity.

Nor were the changes, we have been describing, in the outward appearance of the Church mere movements upon the surface, but indications of a sounder theology that was forming underneath. A reaction against the old Calvinistic doctrines had begun, and was advancing with rapidity and success. Laud found Oxford a seminary of Calvinism, and he left it a school of orthodoxy: he found the foreign Reformers installed as its doctors and divines,

and he left an English Reformer in their place, who has maintained himself in it up to this day. The Calvinists murmured and threatened, but the movement was too strong: the black phalanx were compelled to wheel off before the light of awakening day, and Laud could see from his scaffold, the last sweep of the Genevan gown from our standard theological schools.

And in consistency with this new course that the Church was taking, a different tone of feeling toward Rome ensued. The divines of this time, in forming a comparison of their respective opponents, the Puritan and the Papist, seem to have exercised a liberty of judgment which took them a good deal nearer the one, and further from the other, than had been the position of their predecessors. The points of doctrine in which we differed from Roman Catholics, began to be regarded more leniently, and with an eye more alive to the distinction between essential and non-essential, fundamental and secondary: they appeared under the somewhat diminished names of "*inferior questions*," "*secondary points*," "things from which *offence* was taken," "*differences—diversities of opinion* which need be no bar to communion," and "not so important in themselves as for excommunicating *others* on account of them." A bolder language ventured sometimes a hint about "*logomachies*," "*contentions about words*," "*scholastic subtleties*." "I pray God open *both our eyes*," is the conclusion of Archbishop Bramhall. *Beati Pacifici* was now the maxim. Laud "was not pleased," says Heylin, "*that the Pope should be any longer stigmatized with the name of Antichrist*, and gave a strict charge to his chaplains that *all exasperating passages should be expunged out* of books that were to be licensed for the press, and that no doctrines of the Roman Church should be written against, but those that seemed inconsistent with the established doctrine of the Church of England." Upon which ground, he continues, "his chaplain refused to licence the printing of a book about the Gunpowder Treason, saying to him that brought the book, that we were not so angry with the Papists now, as we were about twenty years since, *and that there was no need of any such books to exasperate them, there being now an endeavour to win them to us by fairness and mildness*. And on the same ground, Brag, chaplain to the Archbishop, refused the licensing of another, called 'The advice of a Son,' unless he might expunge some unpleasing expressions, affirming 'that those passages would offend the Papists whom we were now in a fair way of winning, and therefore *must not use any harsh phrases against them*."

And in the same spirit the writers now selected and appealed to as authorities in the controversy were those who had acted

specially as *mediators* between the Churches, and liberal interpreters of the doctrinal statements on each side, that seemed to be opposed. The names of Grotius, and "others of his charitable way," Wicelius, Cassander, Barnes, Santa Clara, De Dominis, all except the first, Roman Catholics, figure in the pages of Bramhall, Forbes, Hammond, Heylin, and Montague. "I prefer," says Bramhall, "one page of Wicelius,* or Cassander, or Grotius, for true judgment before the works *of an hundred yawning wishers for peace*, who do nothing that tends to the procuring of peace: particularly I do admire the two former for this reason, because their clearer judgment did pierce so deep into the controversies of religion before they were rightly stated. And their free spirit dared to tell the world impartially what was amiss, according to the dictates of their consciences. If any of them be reviled for their charity, the greater is their reward in heaven." "*Well fare our learned and ingenuous countryman Santa Clara*—be it far from me to censure Christian charity and moderation for lukewarmness or atheistical neutrality, like those whose chief religion consists in crying up faction." He even tells us that he had himself "a design once to do his weak endeavour, to disabuse the Christian world" on the subject of this controversy: a design which Bishop Forbes executed in his "Considerationes Modestæ." Bishop Montague held conferences on the subject with the Papal Nuncio Panzani, during the latter's stay at the English Court; they came to nothing indeed, but such facts show plainly enough what the *tendencies* of the Laudian episcopate were. The Archbishop himself did not interfere visibly, it is true, in these proceedings, nor did he write and publish himself: his habitual caution made him always keep himself, as much as his public situation would allow, in the back ground; but we have seen what his *chaplains* did; and the divines here mentioned were all his intimate friends and associates, and had gained their station solely through his patronage.

To sum up with a picture of the Church drawn by a spectator, a Roman Catholic of that day; and acknowledged by Heylin—"*Its doctrines*," he says, "*are altered in many things*, e. g. the Pope not Antichrist, pictures, free-will, predestination, universal grace, inherent righteousness, the preferring of charity before knowledge, the merit of good works; *its professors, they especially of great authority, love temper and moderation, and the thirty-nine Articles seem patient, if not ambitious, of some catholic sense.* Their churches begin to assume a new look, their walls to speak a new language, and some of their divines to teach that

* Wicelius joined Luther at first, but becoming disgusted with the Lutherans, went back to his old Church. Luther persecuted him, and procured his imprisonment.

the Church hath authority in controversies of faith. Men in talking and writing use willingly the once fearful names of priest and altar, and are now put in mind that for exposition of Scripture they are by canon bound to follow the Fathers." Much of this indeed had been the teaching of the Church before, but the Laudian development and expansion of it formed a new era.

It was not to be expected that such manifestations should pass unnoticed in such times; nor did they fail to excite the greatest anger and alarm. The Reformation was, as a matter of course, cast into the teeth of these "innovators" at every step; and they were declared to be renegades from its principles, and recreant and rotten members of their Church. The Reformation simplified Church worship, and you are for overlaying it with ornament and form—the Reformation separated us from Rome, and you are for uniting with her,—was the language with which the kingdom from one end to the other resounded. In short they were met by exactly the same arguments which have of late years been made use of by the opponents of the "Oxford Writers." Nor were the Puritans the only persons who had apprehensions: "*some zealous Protestants,*" we are told, as *distinguished* from the former, "*beheld their actings with no small fear, as biassing too strongly towards Rome.*" And to the destructive precedents of the Reformation period was added an authority much more difficult to answer—that of the respectable and high Church divines of the school immediately preceding them. A popular distinction was made between the "*Old*" and the "*New Episcopal party;*" Baxter declaring of the former—"*The old sort of Episcopal divines that received the public doctrine of the nation contained in the Thirty-nine Articles, Homilies &c. I wholly acquit from any jealousy of this compliance (with Rome); there is much more difference between the old and the new than between the old and the Presbyterians.*"—"It is not *all* Episcopal divines which I suspect of a compliance with Grotius and Cassander, but those of the *later strain,* of the New Episcopal party." And catenæ and strings of names were drawn up against the "*New party,*" much on the same principle as our contemporary's; and they were recalled to the divinity of "Bishops Jewel, Pilkington, Hall, Carleton, Davenant, Morton, Abbot, Usher, Potter, Downham, Grindall, Parker, Hooper, Farrar, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and forty more bishops." To which list Bramhall replies rather summarily—"*As if so many names blended together confusedly in an heap, as a hotchpotch, were able, like a Medusa's head, to transform reasonable persons into stocks and stones.*" He adds, "In commemorating some and pretermitting others, he (Baxter) showeth sometimes want of judgment, and always respect of persons;'

a pretty intelligible mode of saying that he did not regard the divines "commemorated," e. g. the names above given, as any very binding authorities: and yet the greater proportion of them figure as an absolute and supreme court of divinity in the pages of our contemporary.

The "new party" of course protested against having their predecessors thus turned against them; and indeed, with respect to many of the latter, to separate them decidedly, by the name of "old episcopal party," from the "new episcopal party," was an unfair and too broad a distinction, which did not make sufficient account for the one being only a *development* of the other, upon the same broad basis of churchmanship. But they could not at the same time, and did not, deny a variation of *feeling* and *tone* from them; *e. g.* with respect to Rome, the subject-matter in the case of Baxter's charge. Bramhall simply tells Baxter, in reply, that he had no right to draw a distinction which was irrelevant to the question *then in hand, i. e.* between the Puritans and the Church; on which Baxter was taking the one side, and Bramhall the other. *You*, he says, have only to do with our creeds and articles, which old and new party *together believe*, and which you do not; so far as *you* are concerned, we are all of the same "old sort." "If they be old episcopal divines who maintained the doctrines of the Thirty-nine Articles and Homilies, then *we are all* old episcopal divines." "All the world seeth evidently, that all the material differences that we have with *you*, are about those Holy Orders, and that Liturgy, and those Articles, and those rites, *which we received from those old episcopal divines.*"

Indeed, the style of remark in which they allow themselves occasionally on the *extreme opinions* of these latter upon the controverted Roman doctrines, accompanied at times with doubts of the orthodoxy of some of the Reformers, and their mode of *appealing to* them (often in the way of an *argumentum ad hominem* to the Puritans), even more than their mode of *remarking upon* them, show the "new party" internally conscious of more or less of that distinction from the "old," which general opinion had laid down. Forbes is perpetually, page after page, complaining of the mistakes of "Protestants," meaning not Puritans only, but others as well; their exaggerated estimate of Romish errors; their "dangerous and presumptuous mode of arguing," *e. g.* "on the doctrine of Transubstantiation;" of the prejudices of "rigid Protestants," to which he evidently attributes an extraordinary density and difficulty of dealing with. He is "astonished" that Bishop Morton should think so strongly on one point of difference, that Bishop White should "*go to such an extreme*" on another: he thinks Jewel a Zwinglian and Sacramentarian. But in their

mode of *appealing to* them, we have a deeper, perhaps, though a less tangible sign of the same thing: "*I can name you one,*" says Bishop Montague to the Puritans, "*whom you dare not deny to be of credit—Bishop Jewel;*" appealing to the latter as *a kind of authority with the Puritans.* So Sanderson refers the same party to the names of "Jewel, Bilson, Abbot, Buckridge, Carleton —who had particularly written against the antichristian tyranny of the Pope;" and Heylin appeals to "Bishops Davenant and Morton, than whom none were more averse from the Pope— Dr. Davenant, whom even *the libellers themselves* were not like to accuse for a man that purposed the ushering in and advancing of Popery;" and Montague to "Bishops Morton and Usher —no Papists, I know, and I think none *in your opinion.*" Such a style of reference obviously savours more of the argument to *others,* than the standard by which they went themselves. Baxter, in short, has hit off their position, allowing for a certain sectarian unfairness, rather successfully. They did go further than their predecessors, and many of their contemporaries; the "new episcopal party" had advanced upon the old, and were of course, as a school in such a position must be, the more glad to appeal to them on points where they *were* supported by them, because they felt themselves not supported upon *all.*—*We* may be considered *ultra men,* their language is, carrying Church principles to an *extreme,* going *too great* lengths: but what do you say to *such and such divines; they,* at any rate, were not extreme men, or Papists, and they think pretty much with us on this or that point —whatever might be under discussion at the time.

To take three or four names out of the list, by way of seeing how far they were really regarded as complete standards by the later school of churchmen. At the conference between King Charles and the Presbyterians, at Newcastle, the former denies the right of a nation to reform its religion without the authority of the clergy and prince, and Henderson quotes Jewel and Bilson against him; the latter, we may remark, was really a churchman in doctrine, but driven, by a too great vehemence against Rome, into an extreme advocacy of all the proceedings of Protestants: even Bishop Morton censures him. Charles's reply to Henderson is:— "The citing of private men's opinions more than concur with the general consent of the Church in their time, weighs little with me, *it being too well known that rebels never wanted writers to maintain their unjust actions;* and though I much reverence Bishop Jewel's memory, I never thought him *infallible.* For Bilson, I well remember *what opinion the king my father had of him for those opinions,* and how he showed him some favour in hope of his recantation (as his good nature made him do many

things of that kind), but whether he did or not I cannot say. As for Bishop Davenant," who had also been cited against him, he says, simply, "He is none of those to whom I have appealed, or will submit."

This latter prelate, a sound churchman in his way, but a strong Calvinist, gave Laud a good deal of trouble. The latter, following up his scheme for un-Calvinizing the Church, had procured the famous royal declaration, now in our Prayer-Book, against affixing any meaning but the literal and grammatical one, to the Articles, *i.e. inferring* any thing Calvinistically from them; an effectual mode, certainly, if enforced, of clogging the preachers of this party. Davenant disobeyed the order by preaching a vehement Calvinistic discourse in the king's own presence, and was cited before the High Commission Court, and obliged to apologize; Archbishop Harsnet, one of Laud's party, managing the cause against him. Davenant was afterwards of great assistance to Laud, in enforcing his orders on Church ceremonial.

Usher furnishes another instance of the kind. He was Primate of Ireland, at the time that Strafford and Bramhall went over there with the express charge and commission from Laud, to procure from the Irish Convocation the acceptance of the Thirty-Nine Articles, in the room of their own Calvinistic ones of Lambeth; and Strafford and Bramhall both treated him with that respect and consideration, which his high station and sound churchmanship, on most points, deserved. But Usher, like others of the "old episcopal party," held a mixture of views, and though he approved of Laud's plans for the restoration of the Church, did not like sacrificing his Calvinism to them. Some prejudice that he had imbibed from this system, made him even refuse to bow at the name of Jesus; and this refusal, we are told, "bred heats between him and Bramhall." He was found, in short, a difficult person to act with; and when the proposition for superseding the Lambeth Articles was made in Convocation, his inward reluctance to part with them made him, though he was outwardly *for* the change, espouse it so lukewarmly, that the Calvinistic side of the house was emboldened, and rejected it. Strafford, who saw that all chance for the Irish Church was gone if such a victory was allowed, had recourse to a strong expedient: he sent for the primate, and simply told him that it was the king's pleasure that the change should be made, and that Convocation had mistaken their parts by debating upon it—a considerable piece of lay interference, we allow, but justified, perhaps, by the emergency of the time, and the Church authority upon which it, *in reality*, proceeded. The primate returned to Convocation, and the measure passed.

"Hall, Bishop of Exeter," we are quoting Mr. Hallam, "wrote a treatise on the Divine institution of Episcopacy, which, according to an analysis given by Heylin and others of its leading positions, is so much in the teeth of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, that it might pass for an answer to it. *Yet it did not quite come up to the primate's standard,* who made him alter some passages which looked too like concessions. *One of his offences was the asserting the Pope to be Antichrist, which displeased the king as well as primate, though it had been orthodox under James.*"

"The prosecution in the Star-Chamber against Sherfield, Recorder of Salisbury, for destroying some superstitious pictures in a church, led to a display of the aversion many of the council entertained for Popery, *and their jealousy of the archbishop's bias.* They were with difficulty brought to condemn Sherfield, and passed a sentence at least very unlike those to which they were accustomed."

"'To think well of the Reformed religion,' says Northumberland in 1640, '*is enough to make the archbishop an enemy;* and though he cannot for shame do it in public, yet in private he will do Leicester all the mischief he can' (for attending, when French ambassador, the Protestant place of worship at Charenton). Such was the opinion," is Mr. Hallam's remark, "entertained of Laud by those *who could not reasonably be called Puritans, except by such as made that word a synonym for Protestant.*"

"Our Reformation, says Mr. Knox, quoting Dryden, 'was continued by Edward VI. on other principles than those on which it was begun:' *and the line, thus made to diverge, has since again and again been bent inward.*"

Such is the relation in which we find the "old" standing to the "new episcopal party;" nor can there be any greater mistake than that of stringing all our divines together, without distinction or explanation—making them into a mere printer's list, as if all were exactly alike—mere repetitions of each other, like so many bricks out of the kiln, or loaves out of the oven, or so much twist from the wheel, or cloth from the loom, or powder from the mill. A writer who so jams all schools together, and makes such a "hotchpotch," to use Bramhall's word, of our divines, must pardon us, if we cast a doubt upon the accuracy of his acquaintance with the times about which he has treated. There *are* distinctions amongst our divines; our Church divinity has been, as a matter of fact, a *progressive,* not a *stationary* one. The Laudian school was as clearly a *new development* of the Church, in its day, as history can show it. And, be it well noted, it was a *successful* development—it *established* itself. Laud and his party were "innovators" in their day; but how are they regarded now? As our great doctors, the highest standards and brightest ornaments of the Church. Turn to the pages of our contemporary—it is "*Laud and our soundest divines*" throughout; and all his associates are quoted over and over again—Bramhall, Heylin, Forbes, Sanderson, Taylor, Hammond, Cozens, and the rest, as

unexceptionable authorities, "whom all sides must be willing to acknowledge." The truth is, these divines, by dint of immense effort, by a great and strong heave, lifted the Church above the levels of Calvinism, to a higher ground, and that ground has remained our *terra firma* to this day. See how Bishop Tomline, in his answer to Scott, is obliged to apologize for the divines before that time: that Bishop Tomline was enabled to take the anti-Calvinistic side, as the *Church side* of the question—that the Church was for him, and against his antagonist—he might thank Laud, and not the Reformers. *The present orthodox divinity of our Church is a development since the Reformation, and a reaction upon it.* We care not how great innovators the school were considered in *their* time, or upon how slender a thread they seemed to hang: they *succeeded,* and their *innovation* is now our *rule. The Church cannot shake off the Laudian school:* she has identified herself with them; she has accepted their ground, and she stands upon it.

Having thus attempted a general sketch of the formation of our standard divinity, we subjoin, by way of appendix, a series of extracts to illustrate its character, and justify what we have said of it.

A passage from Mr. Hallam will explain very clearly the spirit of our Reformation, on the subject of religious externals.

"The general tendency of Protestants *even in the reign of Edward VI. was toward the simpler forms;* whether through the influence of those foreign divines who co-operated in our Reformation; or because it was natural in the heat of religious animosity to recede as far as possible, especially in such exterior distinctions, from the opposite denomination. *The death of Edward seems to have prevented a farther approach to the scheme of Geneva in our ceremonies, and perhaps in our discipline.*—

"Such a reluctance as the Queen (Elizabeth) displayed to return in every point even to the system established under Edward, was no slight disappointment to those who thought that too little had been effected by it. They had beheld at Zurich and Geneva the simplest, and, as they conceived, the purest form of worship. They were persuaded that the vestments still worn by the clergy, as in the days of popery, though in themselves indifferent, led to erroneous notions among the people, and kept alive a recollection of former superstitions. They disliked other ceremonies for the same reasons. *These objections were by no means confined, as is perpetually represented, to a few discontented persons.* Except Archbishop Parker, who had remained in England during the late reign, and Cox, Bishop of Ely, who had taken a strong part at Frankfort against innovation, *all the most eminent churchmen, such as Jewell, Grindall, Sandys, Nowell, were in favour of leaving off the surplice, and what were called the Popish ceremonies.* Whether these objections are to be considered narrow, or frivolous, or otherwise, it is incon-

sistent with veracity to dissemble that the Queen alone was the cause of retaining those observances, to which the great separation from the Anglican establishment is ascribed. Had her influence been withdrawn, surplices and square caps would have lost their steadiest friend; and several other little accommodations to the prevalent dispositions would have taken place. Of this it seems impossible to doubt, when we read the proceedings of Convocation in 1562, when the proposition to abolish most of the usages deemed objectionable was lost only by a vote, the numbers being fifty-nine to fifty-eight.

"It was proposed, on this occasion, (he adds in a note,) to abolish all Saints' days, to omit the cross in baptism, to leave kneeling at the communion to the ordinary's discretion, to take away organs, and one or two more of the ceremonies then in dispute."

"*The current opinion that these scruples were imbibed during the banishment of our reformers must be received with great allowance.* The dislike to some parts of the Anglican ritual had *begun* at home, it had *broken* out at Frankfort, *it is displayed in all the early documents of Elizabeth's reign by the English divines far more warmly than by their Swiss correspondents. Grindall, when first named to the see of London, had his scruples about wearing the Episcopal habits removed by Peter Martyr.*— *Hallam's Constitutional History*, vol. i. p. 232, *et seq.*

And Heylin thus describes the state of doctrine out of which Laud extricated the Church :—

"It cannot be denied that, by error of these times, *the reputation which Calvin had attained in both universities*, and the extreme diligence of his followers, for the better carrying on of their own designs, *there was a general tendency to his opinions in the present controversies:* so that it is no marvel if many men of good affection to that Church in government and forms of worship, might unawares be seasoned with his principles in point of doctrine; his Book of Institutes being, for the most part, the foundation on which the young divines of those times did build their studies; and having built their studies on a wrong foundation, did publicly maintain some point or other of his doctrines. *Of any man who publicly opposed the Calvinian tenets in the University (Oxford), till after the beginning of King James's reign, I must confess that I have hitherto found no good assurance;* though there were some who spared not to declare their dislike thereof, and *secretly* trained up their scholars in other principles. We find but two (Dr. Buckridge and Dr. Houson) named for anti-Calvinists, in the five controverted points. Yet might there be many others, perhaps some hundreds, who held the same opinions with them, and discovered not themselves, or brake out into any open opposition, as they did at Cambridge. God had 7000 servants in the realm of Israel who had not bowed the knee to Baal, though we find the name of none but the prophet Elijah, the residue keeping themselves so close for fear of danger, that the prophet himself complained to God, 'that he alone was left to serve Him.' A parallel case to which may be that of the Christians during the power and prevalency of the Arian heretics; St. Jerome giving us the names of no more than three, who had stood up stoutly in defence of the Nicean Council, St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, and St. Eusebius, though it

is most clear (by inferences from history) that it was preserved by many others.

"But if none but the three bishops had stood unto the truth, yet had that been sufficient to preserve the Church from falling universally from the faith of Christ—even as a king invaded by a foreign enemy doth keep possession of his realm by some principal fortress, the standing out whereof may in time gain all the rest. Which, I return for answer to the objections, touching the paucity of those authors whom we have produced in maintenance of the anti-Calvinian or old English doctrines: for though they be few in number, and make but a very thin appearance, *apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto*, in the poet's language, yet serve for a good assurance that the Church still kept possession of her primitive truths, *not utterly lost, though much endangered by such contrary doctrines as had of late been thrust upon her.*"—*Heylin's Tracts*, p. 626.

These effects, however, did not follow all at once from the Reformation, which, as we have said, only *opened the doors* to Calvinism, an opening which it took rapid advantage of during the residence of the reforming party abroad in Queen Mary's reign.

"Many of our divines, who had fled beyond the sea to avoid the hurry of Queen Mary's reign, though otherwise men of good abilities in most parts of learning, returned so altered in their principles, as to points of doctrine, that they seemed not to be the same men at their coming home, as they had been at their going hence. Yet such was the necessity which the Church was under of filling up the vacant places and preferments, which had been made void either by the voluntary discession or positive deprivation of the Popish clergy, *that they were fain to take in all of any condition, who were able to do the public service*, without relation to their public opinions in doctrine or discipline: nothing so much regarded in the choice of men for bishopricks, deaneries, dignities in cathedral churches, the richest benefices in the country, and places of most command and trust in the universities, *as their known zeal against the Papists, together with such a sufficiency of learning as might enable them to write and preach against the Pope's supremacy*, &c. &c.

"On this account we find Mr. Pilkington preferred to the see of Durham, and Wittingham to the rich deanery of the Church, of which the one proved a great favourer of the Non-Conformists,* the other associated himself with Goodman, as after Goodman did with Knox, for planting Puritanism and sedition in the Kirk of Scotland. On this account Dr. Laurence Humphrey, a professed Calvinian in point of doctrine, and a Non-Conformist, is made the Queen's Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxon; Thomas Cartwright, that great incendiary of this Church, preferred to be the Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; Sampson made Dean of Christ Church, and presently turned out again for Puritanism; Hardiman made one of the first prebends of Westminster of the Queen's foundation, and not long after deprived of it by the high commissioners for

* The Parker Society have just published Bishop Pilkington's works.

breaking down the altar there, and defacing the ancient utensils and ornaments that belonged to the church. And finally upon this account, as Whytehead, who had been chaplain to Queen Anne Bullen, refused the archbishoprick of Canterbury, so Mr. John Fox, of great esteem for his great and laborious work of Acts and Monuments (commonly called the Book of Martyrs), would not accept of any preferment in the Church but a prebend's place in Salisbury, which tied him not to any residence in the same. And this he did especially (as after proved) to avoid subscription, showing a greater willingness to leave his place than to subscribe unto the Articles of Religion then by law established, when he was legally required to do it by Archbishop Parker."—*Heylin's Tracts*, p. 609.

How seriously do the right-thinkers of that day view the religious perversity of their age.

" Harsnet, afterwards Archbishop of York, preached against 'the absolute decree of Reprobation,' which by that time had been made a part of the Zwinglian gospel, and generally spread abroad both from press and pulpit. '*This opinion*,' he declares, '*is grown high and monstrous, and like a Goliah, and men do shake and tremble at it; yet never a man reacheth to David's sling to cast it down.*' In the name of the Lord of Hosts we will encounter it, for it hath reviled not the host of the living God, but the Lord of Hosts."—*Heylin's Tracts*, p. 603.

We pass over the interval of the intermediate school—the Elizabethan or " old episcopal party" as they were called, whose character has been given above, and proceed at once to those divines whom they ushered in. And first with respect to Rome—the general *prepossession* of the Laudian school in favour of a reunion, is what we remark in the first instance—the *hold* which the idea had upon them—their thinking and scheming about it.

" I will confess that freely," says Bramhall, " which Mr. Baxter neither doth know, nor ever could know but by me, that about thirty years since, when my body was stronger, and my wits fresher, when I had some books and notes of my own, and could have had what supply I desired, and opportunity to confer with whomsoever I pleased, I had then a design indeed to do my weak endeavour to disabuse the Christian world by the right stating and distinguishing of controversies between the Church of Rome and us, and to show,

" First, how many of them are mere logomachies, or contentions about words without any just ground;

" Secondly, how many of them are scholastic subtleties, whereof ordinary Christians are not capable, and consequently no points of faith;

" Thirdly, how many of them are not the controversies of the Churches, but of particular persons or parties in those Churches;

" Fourthly, how many of our controversies are about rites and ceremonies, and things indifferent in their own nature.

" When all these empty names and titles of controversies are wiped out of the roll, the true controversy between us may be quickly mustered, *and will not be found, upon a serious inquiry, to be so irreconcilable as some persons have imagined.* The two dangerous extremes

are to clip away something from saving truth, whereof I do not find the Church of Rome to have been guilty, and to obtrude erroneous or probable opinions for articles of faith, whereof I find many in the Church of Rome to have been most guilty.

"These were my thoughts in my younger days, *which age and experience hath rather confirmed and radicated in me than altered;* which, if they had been known, I deserved rather to have been cherished and encouraged than to be branded by any man as a factor for the pope."—*Bramhall's Reply to Baxter*, p. 623.

To the same charges against Laud, Heylin replies in the same strain.

"If it be a crime, it is a crime of a new stamp, never coined before. I thought when our Saviour said, *Beati Pacifici*, it had been sufficient warrant to any man to endeavour peace, to build up the breaches in the Church, and to make Jerusalem like a city that is at unity with itself; especially where it may be done not only *salvâ charitate*, but *salvâ fide* too. The greatest part of the controversies betwixt us and the Church of Rome not being in the fundamentals, or in any essential point in the Christian religion, I cannot otherwise look upon it, but as a most pious work, to endeavour an atonement in the superstructures."

"But hereof the writer seems to doubt, first, whether such endeavour to agree and compose the differences be lawful or not, and, secondly, whether they be *possible*. As for the lawfulness thereof, I could never see any reason produced against it, not so much as any question made of it, till I found it here. Against the *possibility* thereof it hath been objected that such and so great is the pride of the Church of Rome, that they will condescend to nothing; and therefore if such composition be made, it must not be by their meeting us, but by our going to them. But as that writer says, that many of the archbishop's equals adjudged the design of his to be *impossible*, so may I say (without making any such odious comparisons) *that many men of eminence, both for their parts and piety, have thought otherwise of it.* It was the petulancy of the Puritans on the one side, and the pragmaticalness of the Jesuits on the other, which made the breach wider than it was at first; and had those hot spirits on both sides been calmed awhile, moderate men might possibly have agreed upon such equal terms, as would have laid a sure foundation for the peace of Christendom. Now that all those in the Church of Rome are not so stiffly wedded to their own opinions as that writer makes them, appears first by the testimony of the Archbishop of Spalato, declaring in the High Commission, a little before his going hence, that '*he acknowledged the Articles of the Church to be true, or profitable at the least, and none of them to be heretical.*' *It appears, secondly, by a tractate of Franciscus de Santa Clara, in which he puts such a gloss upon the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England as rendereth them not inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church of Rome.* And if without prejudice to the truth the controversies might have been composed, it is probable that other Protestant Churches would have sued by their agents to be included in the peace; *if not, the Church of England had*

lost nothing by it, as being hated by the Calvinists, and not loved by the Lutherans."—Life of Laud, p. 413.

This general *à priori* desire for unity was the motive our divines started with; a disposition to diminish differences necessarily followed; the enlarged vision overlooking minor points. Allow unity to be important at all, and its importance is immense; how strongly is Thorndike impressed with it.

"*Unity in the Church is of so great advantage to the service of God, and that Christianity from whence it proceedeth, that it ought to overshadow and cover very great imperfections in the laws of the Church. For the unity of so great a body will not allow that the terms should be strict or nice upon which the communion thereof standeth, but obligeth all that love the general good of it to pass by even those imperfections in the laws of it which are visible, if not pernicious."—Preface to Epilogue.*

"Though I sincerely blame the imposing of new articles upon the faith of Christians, and that of positions which I maintain not to be true, yet I must and do freely profess that I find no position necessary for salvation prohibited, none destructive of salvation enjoined to be believed in it. And therefore must I necessarily accept it for a true Church, as in the Church of England I have always known it to be accepted. There remains in the present Church of Rome the profession of all that which it is necessary to believe, either in point of faith or manners. Idolatries I grant to be possible, but not necessary, to be found in it, by the ignorance and carnal affections of particulars, *not by command of the Church or the laws of it.* As for the half Sacrament, the service in an unknown language, the carrying the people from the Scripture—[much as they are to be objected to], it is to be feared that the authors of such hard laws, *will have a strong plea for themselves at the day of judgment, in the unreasonableness of their adversaries."—Conclusion to Epilogue.*

But to proceed to some of the particular points of difference between the Churches—the first in importance is that of the Papacy, a question which not only appealed to this principle of unity for a favourable treatment, along with the rest of the list of differences, but, being on the subject of unity, tested and elicited what our divines' own ideas on that subject were, and what image they had formed of the constitution of the Catholic Church. We will select Bramhall and Thorndike from the list, as representing between them the Church at this time; the difference in the character of their respective views only making their testimony the more complete. An attempt is made by our contemporary to separate Thorndike, as a man of extreme opinions, from the rest of our divines, but his divinity was evidently the natural development of that age, in common with that of his contemporaries. Clarendon indeed says incidentally, in a letter, he is sorry Mr. Thorndike's book is come out. But is any objection made to it on the ground of *principle?* None at all. He objects to

its *unseasonableness*, and "the bad use which might be made of it." It was the interval of the Restoration—the Presbyterians were going to be displaced, and the Church was coming in again to the possession of the Establishment. Thorndike thought this a good opportunity for restoring discipline, and conforming more to the rest of the Church Catholic; but Clarendon dreaded such a fresh difficulty in the approaching struggle with the Presbyterian party, when there had been difficulty enough in maintaining the old Church of England ground. The fact of Clarendon, however, *being afraid* of his book, shows plainly enough that Thorndike's sentiments *had weight*, and that he was an authority with many. The truth is, there was no difference of *principle* between Thorndike and any of the rest; he was a retired divine, and, writing out of the reach of political influences, was less *checked* in his expressions; he was a *philosophical* divine, and he *systematized* what others *held*. The major part of our divines were *official* men, high in the Church, many of them in the *State* as well, and therefore necessarily more *practical* men, obliged to regard times and circumstances.* This is about the difference between his and Bramhall's view of Church unity: both start with the same strong idea of its importance; but Thorndike's is the more *developed, systematic* view, Bramhall's the more *irregular*,

* This attempt to throw a doubt upon the "*soundness*" of Thorndike's divinity the Reviewer is literally *unable to support by a single fact*. What does he bring forward? a private letter from Jeremy Taylor to Evelyn, in which the former says, "*You make me desirous of it* (Thorndike's book) *because you call it elaborate;* but I like not the title nor the subject; and *the man is indeed a very good and learned* man, but I have not seen much *prosperity* in his writings: but if he have so well chosen the questions, there is no peradventure but he hath tumbled into his heap *many choice materials.*" Now it is clear from this, at any rate, that *Evelyn* thought well of the book, and had given a good description of it—*elaborate, subjects well chosen*. So on Evelyn's side there is positively nothing but praise; and the others' exceptions against "the title and the subject" of the book—the want of "*prosperity*" in Thorndike's writings—do they amount to any doubt of the *soundness* of his divinity? Thorndike wrote in a confused, unpopular style, which Taylor doubtless alludes to when he speaks of his "*tumbling into his heap*," &c. On the other hand, he calls him "*a good and learned man*," has no doubt his book contains "*many choice materials*," and is "*desirous*" of reading it. Is this the way in which Taylor would speak in free, private correspondence, of a divine of his Church whom he considered "*unsound*"? And this is the nearest approach to a case of unsoundness that the Reviewer is able to make out. But we are told, in addition, that Barrow wrote against Thorndike: and what if he did? If Barrow wrote against Thorndike, Thorndike might also write against Barrow; and we should be at liberty to choose the one we liked best for our authority. Why the Reviewer himself appeals to Thorndike several times, nay, appeals to him on the very tender subject of "*national* Churches," the very one of all others that would elicit Thorndike's "unsoundness," if he were unsound. It is sufficient against such insinuations to state that Thorndike was one of the authorities of the Church in his day, when we find men appealing to "the most learned and best beloved of her children, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Taylor, *Mr. Thorndike*," &c. (Kennet's Register, vol. i. p. 58,)—that he was elected master of Sidney Sussex College, and only defrauded of the headship by the Puritans —and that after the publication of this book he was, along with other of our great divines, appointed to represent the Church at the Savoy Conference.

matter of fact one; the latter sees a grand society spreading in different branches over the world, and says at once these ought to be united; there must be some means of keeping them so: let us see what concessions we can make to the Pope. Thorndike's system, like all that proceed upon regular principle, is soon seen, at least in outline.

"I say, then, that the apostles and disciples of our Lord Christ, intending to establish one Church of all that should be converted, did agree and appoint that *the churches of the chief cities should be the chief churches, and that the churches of inferior cities should depend upon them.** And the obligation upon the Church must remain, to cherish and maintain that order once established by them: *the unity of the Church, which is the end of it, not being otherwise attainable.*

"Upon this ground I maintain that the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, had from the beginning a privilege of eminence over other Churches. But he that shall compare these cities, and the greatness of them, and eminence over their respective territories, with that of Rome, not only over the rest of the empire, but over those cities, will find it consequent to the ground of this design, that the Church of Rome should (not be sovereign, but) *have that eminence over the Churches of these cities (and, by consequence, much more over the Churches of inferior cities) as is requisite for the directing of such matters as might come to be of common interest to the whole Church, to such an agreement as might preserve the unity thereof.*

"Thus deriving *the pre-eminence of the Church of Rome, not from St. Peter's personal pre-eminence only, but from an order given out by the Apostles,* you easily see that the concurrence of St. Paul with St. Peter to the founding of it, is a confirmation of that ground."—*Epil.* iii. 163.

Bramhall's view consists of a string of admissions to Rome, which, as coming from so undoubted a representative of the Church in his day (whatever may be said of Thorndike), is worth attention.

A "Universal Bishop," i. e. in the sense of "challenging *universal jurisdiction,*" he does not decide against, but puts down as "*controverted whether lawful or unlawful.*"† He admits the expression that "the Pope *omni præsidet creaturæ,* is above every creature:" and "that the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, is *principium unitatis,* the beginning of unity, and hath a principality of order above all Christians." "To which Primacy of Order," he adds, "*great privileges are due.*—It implieth a headship as well as supremacy of order; neither is it destitute of all power. It hath some power *essential* annexed to it, to congregate, propose, give sentence—some

* He "does not pretend, however, to produce *any act under the apostles'* hands, but to argue that those things which have come to pass in the Church, *could not otherwise have come to pass, than by a constant order ever since the apostles.*"

† Bramhall, new ed. vol. i. p. 253.

power *accessory*, to execute the canons, &c." in which sphere it exacts obedience, "*sub pœnâ spirituali.*"* Which "superiority of order was necessary to prevent schism," inasmuch as "in *all* societies a head of order is necessary to prevent and remedy schism, that there may be one to convocate the society, to propose doubts, to receive votes, to pronounce sentence." "We do confess that the Primitive Papacy, that is, *exordium unitatis*, was an excellent means of concord; we do not envy the Bishop of Rome any honour which the Catholic Church did allow him. *We seek not the extirpation of the Papacy.*"† For "though the faults of the Papacy are woven into the body of it, *they are not inseparable*, time was when the Papacy was without those blemishes."—"*We are not so stupid as not to see that some good use may be made of an Exordium Unitatis Ecclesiasticæ, especially at this time when the civil power is so much divided and distracted.*"—"The Pope might still for us carry his Proto-patriarchate, and the dignity of an Apostolical Bishop and his Primacy of Order, so long as the Church thought fit to continue it to that see."—"I wish to see the Church restored to its ancient splendour of an Apostolical Church, and the principal Proto-patriarchate and the Beginning of Unity." In this sense Bramhall had no objection to the Pope being called *Head of the Church*. "If, under the name of the Universal Church (he is replying to Baxter), he include the *triumphant* Church, we know no head of the Universal Church but Christ. If he limit it to the militant Church, we are as much against one single monarch as he—*yet we quarrel with no man about the name of Head*, or a metaphorical expression." We may mention that both King James and King Charles addressed the Pope as "*Most Holy Father*," for which they were sharply reprehended by the Puritans. When called to account by Baxter for those admissions, Bramhall only replies by repeating them.

"That St. Peter had a fixed chair at Antioch, and after that at Rome, is a truth which no man, who giveth any credit to the ancient Fathers and councils and historiographers of the Church, can either deny or well doubt of.

"Secondly, that St. Peter had a Primacy of order among the Apostles, is the unanimous voice of the primitive church, not to be contradicted by me; which the Church of England and *those old Episcopal divines, whom he pretendeth to honour so much*, did never oppose. The learned Bishop of Winchester acknowledgeth as much, not only in his own name, but in the name of the Church of England, both King and Church knowing it and approving it. Neither is it questioned among us whether St. Peter had a Primacy, but what that primacy was. The King doth not deny Peter to have been the Prime and Prince of the Apostles.

* Bramhall, old ed. 364. † Ibid. 270.

"My third assertion is, that some Fathers and Schoolmen, who were no sworn vassals to the Roman Bishop, do affirm that this Primacy of order is affixed to the chair of St. Peter and his successors for ever. As, for instance, Gerson, for a schoolman, that learned Chancellor of Paris, who sided with the Council against the Pope, and left his enmity to the innovations of the court of Rome as an hereditary legacy to the School of Sorbonne. "*Auferibilis non est usque ad consummationem seculi Vicarius Sponsus Ecclesiæ. The Vicarial Spouse of the Church* (this was the language of the age, whereby he meaneth not the person of any particular Pope, but the office of the Papacy), *ought not to be taken away until the end of the world.*" And among the Fathers I instance St. Cyprian, whose public opposition to Pope Stephen is well known, who seemeth not to dissent from it. In his epistle to Antonianus he calls the see of Rome *the place and chair of Peter* (Ep. 52.) And in his 55th Epistle to Cornelius, 'They dare sail and carry letters from schismatical and profane persons to the *Chair of Peter, and the Principal Church from which sacerdotal unity did spring.*' And in his *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, 'Although he give equal power to all his Apostles after his resurrection, &c. yet to manifest an unity, he constituted *one chair, and by His own authority disposed the original of that unity beginning from one.*' And a little after, '*The Primacy is given to Peter, to demonstrate one Church of Christ and one chair.*'"—*Bramhall*, p. 628.

Hammond admits "the Primacy and dignity of order which belonged to Rome"—"the precedence and dignity of the Bishop of Rome," that "in respect of order and priority of place the Bishop of Rome had it among the Patriarchs, as the Patriarchs among the Primates;" and that "as for fraternal communion, and such as is granted from one Church to another, it is willingly granted to the Roman Church,—if instead of fraternal communion it be *subjection* to the Roman see, then we willingly grant to that see all that the ancient canons allowed it."* And even Field,—

"We deny not but that blessed Peter had a kinde of Primacie of honour and order, that in respect thereof, all Metropolitans do succeed him, as being greater than other bishops in honour and place; and amongst them the Romane Bishop in the first place....

"We deny not, therefore, to the Romane bishop his due place among the prime Bishops of the world, if therewith he will rest contented, but Universal Bishop in sort before expressed, we dare by no means admit him to be, knowing right well, that every bishop hath in his place, and keeping his own standing, power and authority immediately from Christ, which is not to be restrained or limited by any but by the company of bishops; wherein, *though one be chief for order sake, and to preserve unity, and in such sort, that all things must take their beginning from him*, yet he can do nothing without them."—*Field on the Church*, v. p. 32.

* Hammond, i. 512, 517; ii. 7.

"Touching the presidentship of General Councils, it pertained in a sort to all the patriarches....Yet we deny not, but that as these were over all other bishops, so even amongst these also there was an order, so that one of them had a pre-eminence above and before another. For the Bishop of Alexandria was before the Bishop of Antioch, and the Bishop of Rome before him, anciently even before the time of the Nicene Council, and afterwards the Bishop of Constantinople, made a patriarch, was set before the other two, next unto the Bishop of Rome....

"The Canon of the Church prescribeth that no General Council shall be holden without the Bishop of Rome, and the bishops subject to him; but the meaning of the Canon is, not that all proceedings are void and unlawful, wherein his presence is not had, but wherein it is not sought and expected."—*Id.* v. 50.

And Laud—

"The Catholic Church is the Mother of all Christians. Rome as an elder sister (but not the eldest neither) *had a great care committed unto her in and from the prime times of the Church, and to her bishop in her.*"

"If *the* Catholic she be not, yet Apostolic I hope she is, as being the see of one, and he a prime Apostle."—*Laud's Conference with Fisher*, p. 241.

Compare the above acknowledgments with the following from Cranmer: the former argue *from tradition* for the Roman Primacy; the latter makes the Roman Primacy a *reductio ad absurdum* of tradition.

"If traditions apostolic have the force of God's word,* so that every one is bound to the observation of them, *the Bishop of Rome hath the advantage thereby to establish his Primacy:* not such a primacy as he hath lately usurped, but such a primacy as he hath had by prerogative from the beginning; that is to say, to be one of the four Patriarchs of Christendom, and the chief of all four. And the traditions be the chief authorities whereupon Pighius stayeth himself. And furthermore, if we admit traditions to be of such authority, it is to be feared that we must resort to the Church of Rome, as the oldest and the mother Church. Cyprian calls Rome *Petri Cathedram, et ecclesiam principalem.*"—Strype, Edw. VI. ii. P. 1, p. 215.

To turn from the question of the Papacy to the other and more secondary points of difference with Rome. What does Montague, one of those "*soundest divines*" whom our contemporary so admires, say on the subject of Invocation of Saints?

"*It is in confesso, that all the saints departed, each several saint departed, and with God, do and doth incessantly invoke the High Majesty of heaven, pro nobis miseris peccatoribus.*"—*Invocation of Saints*, 190.

After mentioning the corruptions of the practice in the Church of Rome, he comments on the instance of the virgin Justina, mentioned by St. Cyprian:

* The common language for denying *all* force whatever to tradition.

" But this virgin Justina had been better brought up, and taught better things than so. First, she prepareth herself, by fasting and scleragogie, to dispose her prayers and her devotions aright. Secondly, she taketh Christ her Patron, that was her Spouse: for it is more than probable she was a votary. Thirdly, she taketh in, *tanquam ex abundanti, the Blessed Virgin by the way*, as if resolving thus—'What she can do, I know not; if any thing she can do, her help and assistance also I implore'—going upon some uncertain persuasion that the Virgin Mary happily might, by some extraordinary dispensation, have some special patronage over virgins—*which is no absurdity, much less impiety, and was grounded on a general persuasion of the Church, that the saints, though in heaven, had interest some way in the state of their friends, allies, and companions, especially for professions of life, societies of men, countries, and churches whereof themselves were.*"—*Invocation of Saints*, 181.

Bishop Forbes, again:

" No authority can be produced for this custom, for the three first centuries; but many lawful and useful customs were introduced by fathers and councils subsequently to that period, as no sane person can deny. The invocation or addressing of angels and saints, that they pray unto God with us, and for us, I can prove to be neither unlawful nor useless."—*Modestæ Considerationes, De Invoc.* c. iii.

Thorndike's view is systematic, as usual:

" I will distinguish three sorts of prayers to saints, whether taught or allowed to be taught in the Church of Rome. The first is of those that are made to God, but to desire his blessings through the merits and intercession of his saints.' (He instances those in the Breviary): '*We pray thee, Lord, by the merits of the saints whose relics are here, . . . that we who truly believe her the Mother of God may be helped by her intercessions with thee.*' The second is the *ora pro nobis* and the *te rogamus audi nos*, positively addressed to the Blessed Virgin and saints. The third is where they desire immediately of them the same blessings which all Christians desire of God. There is a Psalter to be seen with the name of God changed everywhere into the name of the Blessed Virgin. There is a book of devotion in French with this title—*Moyen de bien servir, prier et adorer la Vierge Marie.*"

Of the first class of prayers he pronounces decisively that "*it is entirely agreeable to Christianity.*" Of the second he declares that "*it is not idolatry,*" and that "*the greatest lights of the Greek and Latin Church have all of them spoken to the saints departed, and desired their assistance.*" Of the third he says, that "*taking them at the foot of the letter,*" they are " mere idolatries;" but that " the words of them *are capable of the same limitation* that the words of Our Lord are,—'*they may receive you into everlasting habitations,*'—God shall do it in *consideration* of them—(he means, that the above kind of prayers, in the same way, though apparently made to saints as to God, *may* really only mean to address God *through* them)—and that there is *ground enough for such a construction even in the belief of one God alone, which stands at the head of their creed, which we have no reason to believe the Church allows them secretly to renounce when she allows them to make these prayers.*"—*Epilogue*, iii. p. 356.

On the subject of Relics, is there not *depth and feeling* in Bramhall's language?

"Abundant love and duty doth extend an honourable respect from the person of a dear friend or noble benefactor, *to his posterity, to his memory, to his monument, to his image, to his relics, to every thing that he loved, even to the earth which he did tread upon, for his sake.* Put a virtuoso among a company of rare pictures, and he will pick out the best pieces for their proper value; but a friend or child will more esteem the picture of a benefactor or ancestor for its relation."—New ed. p. 44.

Thorndike pursues the subject further:

"'We believe that we are most sincerely to honour the corpses of the saints, specially the reliques of the martyrs: if any man do against this sentence, he is no Christian, but a follower of Eunomius and Vigilantius.'—*Reverence in preserving the remains of their bodies and burying them, celebrating the remembrance of their agonies every year, assembling themselves at their monuments, making the days of their deaths festivals, burying their remains under the stones upon which the Eucharist was celebrated—what was all this but Christianity?*—Nay, though St. Jerome confesses that those poor women who lighted candles in honour of them had a zeal of God not according to knowledge, why should this seem an unfit ceremony? If Vigilantius could not down with this, I have nothing to do with Vigilantius."—*Epilogue*, iii. p. 360.

On the reverence due to Images and Pictures, hear Bishop Montague:

"Images are not unlawful unto Christians: the pictures of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and Saints, may be made, and had in houses and set up in churches. And the setting of them up, suffering them to stand, using them for ornaments, for helps of memory, of affection, of rememoration, cannot be abstracted, to my understanding, *from reverence and honour simply in due kind.* Can a man have the true representation of his prince, parents, patrons, &c., without awe, respect, regard, love, reverence, moved by aspect, and wrought in him? I profess my imperfection, or what they will call it; it is so with me. Unco impacto in Latrinas, in Gemonias, in malam crucem—the pictures, statues, paintings, representations of Christ, the Virgin, Apostles, martyrs, holy men and women; unless the very having and preserving of them do in some sort *imply respect, regard, and honour done unto them.*"—*Appeal*, p. 253.

Thorndike thus speaks of the Second Council of Nice, which enjoined Image Worship:

"*That the decree of the Council enjoins no idolatry, notwithstanding whatsoever prejudice to the contrary, I must maintain as unquestionable.* So far is it from leaving any room for the imagination of any false Godhead, that it expressly distinguisheth that honour done to the image of our Lord Christ to be *equivocally* called worship, *i. e.* to be only so called, but not to signify the esteem of God. He that believes the Holy Trinity

can no way attribute the latter; and therefore, *if he puts off his hat and bows the knee to the image of our Lord, it shall be no idolatry.*"—*Epilogue*, iii. p. 363.

The doctrine of Purgatory meets with the same considerate treatment. "Let it keep," says Bishop Andrewes, "*its place among the opinions of the schools.*" "*Let not Protestants condemn it as impious or heretical,*" says Bishop Forbes. The latter even approves of the notion of

"an expiatory purgatory, a kind of middle place, in which, without the pains of hell, the souls of the saints perfect themselves in the love of God with fervid and deep sighs, enjoying the sight and presence of Christ's humanity, and of the holy angels"—

and quotes with approbation the "Institution of a Christian Man," a book published by the authority of Convocation, A. D. 1544:

"Inasmuch as the Book of Maccabees, and the writings of the old doctors of the Church, and common charity, declare that it is a pious and wholesome custom to pray for the dead—we ought therefore to think that prayers for the dead are pleasing to God, and by no means inefficacious. *It is also agreeable to Christian charity and the custom of the Church, that we should make memorial of our departed brethren in the celebration of masses and in funerals*, and that alms should be offered for them. For these acts, we must hope, both *bring positive advantage to them*, and also prove our own love. But the place where the souls of the dead live, and its name, and their state and condition, are uncertain."—*Cons. Modest.* p. 261.

He does not scruple even at the opinion of the Archbishop of Spalato—

"Prayers and oblations of the holy mysteries for the dead ought not to be condemned; for though not to be found in Scripture, they are agreeable to a most ancient practice of the Church, which the holy fathers refer to apostolical tradition. And though no purgatory, strictly speaking, can be collected thence, yet we may gather that there is a certain place assigned to the souls of the departed, in which they are able to obtain (*indulgentiam peccatorum*) a mitigation of the penalties of sin, through the prayers of the Church."—*Consid. Modest.* p. 265.

On the Sacrifice of the Mass Bramhall thinks there is "*no difference between the Churches, if rightly understood.*"*

"The holy Eucharist is a commemoration, or representation—an application of the all-sufficient propitiatory Sacrifice of the Cross. If his sacrifice (the Sacrifice of the Mass) have any other propitiatory power or virtue in it, let him speak plainly what it is. *Bellarmine knew no more.*"—Old ed. p. 172.

Transubstantiation the former divine pronounces to be by no

* Margin, p. 255, old ed.

means *an impious or heretical supposition, believed by many of the faithful from the earliest times:**

"Many Protestants argue most dangerously and presumptuously, that God could not change bread substantially into the body of Christ. God can do many things above the conceptions both of men and angels:—*nay, many things that we firmly believe are not less impossible and contradictory on principles of reason, than Transubstantiation, e. g.* the resurrection of the body. Let us ever have magnificent, vast, immeasurable conceptions of the ineffable omnipotence of God."—*Forbes, Cons. Mod.* p. 388, 396.

"No man denieth a *change, an alteration, a transmutation, a transelementation,*" says Montague. "A *conversion,*" says Cosin.† And Laud admits the decree of the Council of Trent as explained by Bellarmine, with only a seemingly secondary exception to the latter's use of the word "conversion."

"'Whatsoever is concerning the manner and forms of speech,' says Bellarmine, 'this is to be held, that the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is substantial but after a secret and ineffable manner, and not like in all things to *any natural conversion* whatever.' "Now if he had left out conversion, is Laud's comment, and affirmed only Christ's real presence there, after a mysterious and indeed ineffable manner, *no man could have spoke better.*"—*Conference with Fisher,* p. 188.

Thorndike, condemning the Puritan doctrine, that "justifying faith consists in a man believing that he is one of the elect," says,

"*Certainly the Church of Rome holdeth no error in the faith any thing near so pernicious as this: that of Transubstantiation is a mere fleebite in comparison of it.* He who by reason of his education is afraid to think that the elements remain, is he therefore become incapable of the Spirit of God conveyed by the body and blood of our Lord in the Sacrament? And certainly that (*i. e.* the presence of the *body and blood*) is *the prime interest of our Christianity* in the Sacrament, though the bodily presence of the elements is no way prejudicial to the same."—*Conclusion to Epilogue.*

On the subject of the Adoration of the Eucharist, the difference between our divines and the Church of Rome was that which followed from the difference with respect to transubstantiation—a difference, which made the actual bread and wine, with the former, only objects of *secondary* honour; their material *substance* (though changed into the body and blood) still *remaining;* whereas the Roman doctrine, leaving the substance of the body and blood *only,* made the bread and wine themselves

* Consid. Modest. p. 411.

† Cosin does not deny the change of the *substance* of the bread and wine altogether, but that it is "changed *in such sort that the bare accidents do alone remain.*"—*Hist. of Transub.* p. 61.

objects of the divine worship, because bread and wine they *remained no longer:* all that existed substantially was Christ's body and blood, a proper object of divine worship. On this ground Bishop Forbes entirely acquits the Roman Catholics of idolatry in worshipping the bread and wine:

"Most Protestants accuse Roman Catholics of gross idolatry, in adoring the *bread;* whereas, on this supposition, that the bread is no longer bread, but the body of Christ only--a supposition by no means impious or heretical—*they are not idolaters; for the body of Christ is truly to be adored, and that it is which they adore.*"—*Mod. Con.* p. 439.

"*I do not charge the Church of Rome with idolatry,*" says Bramhall. "In the one place I speak of the adoration of the Sacrament as an abuse, but *not one word about idolatry:* in the other I speak of the *peril of* idolatry, but not a word of the adoration of the Sacrament. Should we charge the whole Church with idolatry for the error of a party? Though the Church of Rome do give (*materially*) divine worship to the creature, (or at least a party among them), I am so charitable as to hope that they *intend* it to the Creator."—Old ed. p. 172.

Our contemporary ought surely to have qualified his sweeping assertion of "the concurrent declaration of our divines that Rome is guilty of idolatry." It does not follow because Bilson says decisively, "*You adore the creatures of bread and wine instead of Christ,*" that therefore all our divines thought the same. There is a class, whom he himself appeals to at every page, who think differently.

For themselves, giving the *material* bread and wine only that honour which is due to them as *representing** Christ, they adored the body and blood—they adored, as they expressed it, "*Christ in the Eucharist.*"

"*Christ in the Eucharist,*" says Forbes, quoting the Archbishop of Spalato, "*is to be adored with divine worship,* inasmuch as his living and glorified Body is present therein."—*Ibid.* p. 440.

"Those rigid Protestants who deny that we should adore Christ in the Eucharist, or say that we should only adore him internally and mentally, not with any external sign of adoration, such as bending the knee, or some other bodily movement, are guilty of a monstrous error. Such persons are commonly heterodox on the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Sacrament altogether. To condemn as unlawful that external adoration which all Christians, from the very times of the Apostles, have paid in receiving the Eucharist, is the very extreme of rashness and presumption."—*Ibid.* p. 438.

And he quotes with approbation a Roman Catholic writer:

"We vary our external signs of adoration according to the time or place, or custom of those we are with. When the Sacrament is carried

* For the true meaning of *representing*, see Thorndike, Epilogue, Book iii. p. 10, 40, 44.

to the sick, we kneel, or, if the street is dirty, uncover the head. If we happen to be in a carriage at the time, we show any mark of reverence our situation allows of. Sick people receive the Sacrament sitting or lying down, showing all the reverence they can; priests consecrate and take it standing."—*Mod. Con.* old ed. p. 439.

Bramhall again:

"*The sacrament is to be adored,* says the Council of Trent; *i. e.* formally the body and blood of Christ, say some of your authors,—*we say the same:* the sacrament, that is, the species of bread and wine, say others. That we deny, and esteem it to be idolatrous:"—Old ed. p. 172.

i. e. materially, not *intentionally,* as he said above. Thorndike, however, proceeds further, and unites the *material,* or *visible,* or *sacramental* part so intimately with the *invisible* or divine, that, superseding the *distinction above drawn,* he makes them *both together one object of worship.*

"It is not *necessarily* the same thing to worship *Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist,* as to worship *the sacrament of* the Eucharist; *yet in the sense which reason of itself justifieth it is.* For the sacrament of the Eucharist is neither the visible kind, nor the invisible grace of Christ's body and blood (separately), but the union of both. So that he who worships the one, worships the other; he who worships *Christ in the sacrament* (the invisible grace) worships *the sacrament* (the visible kind.)"—*Epilogue,* p. 352.

And thus he is enabled to state his view with greater freedom and fulness.

"I suppose *that the body and blood of Christ may be adored, wheresoever they are, and must be adored by a good Christian* where the custom of the Church requires it—adored in consideration of the Godhead to which it remains inseparably united. The body and blood of Christ is necessary to be honoured, because necessarily united to that which is honoured,—viz. the Godhead. *And the presence thereof in the sacrament of the Eucharist is a just occasion to express by the bodily act of adoration that inward honour.* I do believe that it was so practised and done in the ancient Church. *There is no just cause why it should not be done at present,* but that cause which justifies the reforming of some part of the Church without the whole. I do expressly warn all opinions, that they imagine not to themselves the Eucharist so mean and simple a sign of the thing signified, that *the celebration thereof should not be a competent occasion for the executing of that worship which is always due to our Lord incarnate.*"—*Epilogue,* iii. p. 350.

Compare these extracts with Bishop Morton's high-churchmanship (far more than people will admit now) that "we bow *as well* when there is *no* Eucharist on the table as when there *is*—not to the table of the Lord, but to the Lord of the table;" and the change of the Caroline theology will appear so clearly, as to suggest

that it is only the extreme difference of the modern, making the two schools of old divines appear one and the same in comparison with it, which confounds the two together in our eyes.

On another department of doctrine upon which our Church is generally understood to be in diametrical opposition to Rome, though she has never spoken, in any shape, against it, they are equally clear and explicit—we mean that relating to what are called "evangelical counsels" or "counsels of perfection;" and by modern theologians considered snares of the devil, vanities, ebullitions of the natural man, and attributed to superstition, pride and self-righteousness.

E. g. on the subject of Virginity.

"So say I still," says Bishop Montague, "touching *evangelical counsels*. I know no doctrine of our English Church against them. I do believe there are and ever were *evangelical counsels*, such as St. Paul mentioneth in his *Consilium autem do* [concerning Virginity]; such as our Saviour pointed at and directed unto in his *Qui potest capere capiat* (on the same subject). If any man, not knowing or not considering the state of the question, hath otherwise written, or preached, or taught, what is that to me or the doctrine of the Church of England? His ignorance, or fancy, or misapplying, is not the doctrine of antiquity, which with *universal* consent held *evangelical counsels;* nor of our Church, in which our Gamaliel hath told us that 'many vows may be freely made and performed to God which are not *commanded* by God.'—'We allow,' says Bishop Morton, 'the distinction between *precepts* and *counsels*.'"—*Montague's Appeal*, p. 215.

So Jeremy Taylor—

"Virginity (he means of the '*chosen and voluntary*' sort, that of 'those who offer that state to God, and mean not to enter into the state of matrimony') is a life of angels, the enamel of the soul, the huge advantage of religion, the great opportunity for the retirement of devotion; and being empty of cares, it is full of prayers; being unmingled with the world, it is apt to converse with God; and by not feeling the warmth of a too forward and indulgent nature, flames out with holy fires, till it be burning like the cherubim, and the most extasied order of holy and unpolluted spirits."

Laud wished to encourage celibacy among the clergy, and would have done so had the times allowed him.

"In the late agitations at Woodstock he let fall some words that were interpreted to the disparagement of the married clergy. He was a single man himself, and he wished perhaps, as St. Paul once did, that all men else (that is to say all men in *holy orders*) would remain so likewise. And some occasion being offered at that time to speak about the conveniences and inconveniences of a married clergy, he made some declaration of himself to this effect, *that in disposing of all ecclesiastical*

promotions he would prefer the single man before the married, supposing the abilities of the persons were otherwise equal."*—*Heylin's Life*, p. 224.

On voluntary poverty, again, Bishop Montague.

" ' *If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast.*' It is true I do grant it a *counsel*, and no imperious *precept*, at least to all men; a *kind* of mandate, though not properly. ' And yet (addressing the Puritans, who would not allow of *counsels*) you are *tied* to do it; it is sin to you not to do it, for you are persuaded it is a precept; but you neither obey it, nor will you suffer others to obey it that would; for you would account and style him a papist that would do it; you would begge him *that should put it in use and practice; for such opinion you hold of the ancient monks and ascetæ as St. Anthony and others that did practise it.*' After quoting St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom, he proceeds: ' You cannot deny this constant resolution of antiquity. Change therefore your manners or your minds; be papists with me, or rebels without me. If St. Chrysostom and his fellow-ancients be papists, be it so; I am content to be so accounted; for I mean to be a papist with them rather than a *noveller* with you.' "—*Montague's Appeal*, p. 219.

Bishop Andrewes, along with the list of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists, and Martyrs, gives thanks for

" The *Ascetics*,
The beauty of *Virgins*."

And prays for

" Those who are in *virginity*
and purity and *ascetic* life,
also those who live in honourable marriage."

And his life of celibacy is mentioned in the inscription on his tomb. Bramhall disapproves of the perpetual vow, but thinks that if that were changed to the " form of our English Universities, or of the Canonesses and Biggins on the other side the seas," and other changes made, " monasteries might agree well enough with reformed devotion."

And Thorndike:

" The Church of England hath no monasteries, as not essential to the constitution of a Church, though advantageous to the maintenance of that retirement from the world wherein our *common Christianity* consisteth, by that *visible* retirement wherein this *profession* consisteth. For the constitution thereof, *after that horrible act of abolishing the monasteries, under Henry VIII.*, it is no marvel if it were difficult to agree in a form which the Reformation might allow and cherish. *Yet is no son of the Church of England bound to disown the whole Church in maintain-*

* These sentiments " gave no little ground of scandal," adds Heylin, " to many honest and well minded men," and caused a " general murmur." Laud, " sensible of the inconveniences which might grow upon it," officiated publicly shortly afterwards at the marriage of one of his chaplains.

ing, as she has, the monastic life to be agreeable with Christianity, and expedient to the intent of it."—*Epilogue*, iii. p. 371.

And—

"It might seem that the ordinary state of those who are engaged in the world is of more perfection than monastic life, as furnishing greater opportunities for the exercise of that charity wherein our Christianity chiefly consisteth. To which I answer, that though the occasions of the world minister more opportunities of exercising charity, *yet the engagements which a man that liveth in the world hath, make it more difficult for him. In the profession of monastic life there is ground for presuming that those who live in it, come nearer what our baptism professeth, by the means thereof, than others can do.*"—*Ibid.* p. 372.

So, too, Sir Roger Twisden:

Some there are either so averse from the calling, or so in love with the possessions religious people were endowed with, as they held an opinion that there should have been no reformation, but an absolute extirpation of them. In which yet Latimer, a glorious martyr, did not concur, who would have had two or three saved in every shire. And certainly those men to my understanding do rather concur with the Donatists than the ancient fathers of the Church. For to speak seriously and without passion, what can the ill be (without other consequence) to have places set apart, whither men either by nature, time, or otherwise, unfit for the world, may retire themselves in religious company, may think on heaven and good learning."—*Monastic Life*, p. 31.

Sir Henry Spelman's lament over the dissolution of the monasteries is stronger still; entering, at the same time, more at large into their *practical* uses.

"I have here given the instance only of such as were the first actors in the violation and subversion of monasteries; lest therefore thou shouldst think that the crime and the punishment endeth with them, consider with me the condition and success both of our commonwealth in general and of private families in particular before the dissolution, and observe them after, and we shall find just cause to think *that there is a cursed thing among us. For while our religious houses stood*, they employing their revenues according to the donor's direction, opened wide their hospitable gates to all comers, and, without the charge of a reckoning, welcomed all travellers until the statute of 1 Edw. I. restrained and limited them; and casting their bread upon the waters *they relieved the neighbouring poor without the care of the two next justices of peace, or the curse of a penal law.* While they stood the younger children both of lords and commons were provided for without the ruin of their father's estate, and not left as now often to an unworthy, necessitous, and vicious course of life. *We had then no new laws (the offspring of new vices), to erect houses of correction for bad and vagrant persons, to provide stock to bind poor children apprentices, or to make weekly levies to maintain the weak, lame, indigent people, or our new charge of an annual subsidy at least;* for these were provided for, those prevented by the charity of our religious

houses. And then the families and estates of our nobility and gentry continued long through very many descents. But when covetous sacrilege got the upper hand of superstitious charity, and destroyed all our monasteries, all our religious houses, the preservers of learning by their learned works and laborious manuscripts, the suppressors of vice by their strict, regular and exemplary life, (though some, nay many of them, sons of Eli, made the offerings of the Lord to stink before the people)—then all their lands, appropriations, tithes, and oblations coming into the king's hand, policy, to prevent a restitution, distributes them among the laity; some the king exchanges, some he sells, others gives away; and by this means (like the dust flung up by Moses,) they presently disperse all the kingdom over, and at once become curses both upon the families and estates of the owners; they often viciously spending on their private occasions what was piously intended for public devotion."—*Spelman's Violation of Churches*, p. 40.

So much for the views of churchmen and divines of this age on many of the particular subjects of difference between us and Rome; we are not surprised after them to hear Bramhall expressing his willingness to unite with the Church of Rome *as she was; not requiring any change of doctrine in her*, but only a certain liberty to other churches.

"If you would be contented to waive your last four hundred years' determinations; or, *if you liked them for yourselves*, yet not to obtrude them upon other churches—much good might be expected from free councils and conferences from moderate persons; and we might yet live in hope to see an union."—New ed. vol. 1, p. 80.

"I determine nothing but only crave leave to propose a question to all moderate Christians who love the peace of the Church, and long for a reunion thereof. If the Bishop of Rome were reduced from his universality of sovereign jurisdiction *jure divino* to his *principium unitatis*, and his court regulated by the canons of the Fathers, which was the sense of the Councils of Constance and Basle—if the *creed* or *necessary* points of faith were reduced to what they were in the time of the four first General Councils,—admitting only *necessary explications*—if some things from whence *offences are either given or taken* were put out of divine offices—whether Christians might not live in a holy communion, and join in the same public worship of God."—New ed. vol. 1, p. 279.

Hammond thought that—

"the wars and seditions, and divisions, and rebellions that are raised and managed upon account of religion, were *far greater and more scandalous unchristian evils, than are the errors of some Romish doctrines.*"

And—

"that such primacy of the Bishop of Rome as the ancient canons allowed him were, for so glorious end as the regaining the peace of Christendom, very reasonably to be afforded him, *nay absolutely necessary to be yielded him.*"—Vol. ii.—*On Ignatius' Epistles*, p. 46.

Which were the sentiments in short of the whole Laudian party, if we may trust the account of a contemporary, that—

"as to a reconciliation between the Churches of England and Rome, there were made some general propositions and overtures by the Archbishop's agents, they assuming that his Grace was very much disposed thereunto; and that if it was not accomplished in his life time it would prove a work of more difficulty after his death; that in very truth for the last three years the Archbishop had introduced some innovations approaching near the rites and forms of Rome; *that the Bishop of Chichester, a great confidant of his Grace, the Lord Treasurer and eight other Bishops of his Grace's party, did most passionately desire a reconciliation with the Church of Rome;* that they did day by day recede from their ancient tenets to accommodate with the church of Rome; that therefore the Pope, on his part, ought to make some steps to meet them. The composition on both sides was in so good a state of forwardness before Panzani left the kingdom, that the Archbishop and Bishop of Chichester had often said that there were but two sorts of people to impede or hinder the reconciliation, to wit, the Puritans among the Protestants, and the Jesuits among the Catholics."*—*Heylin's Laud*, p. 414.

Such passages as these must be allowed, we think, at any rate, to prove a different idea of our position toward Rome, than what has obtained since. The divines of this time did not take that *fixed* view of it—did not consider our state of separation from her as one of those immutable, unalterable things—one of those laws of nature, so to say, which people now think it to be; as if the isolation of our Church were as comfortable a position for her as any other—quite an understood thing, and requiring no explanation—*our way*, our privilege, and so forth. They took into account the force of circumstances, indeed, and submitted to it, but only as a *temporary, intermediate, provisionary* state—to last *until* something could be done to alter it—*until* the Church could meet and settle affairs—*until*

"God should grant us the benefit of an ecumenical or occidental council, when it would become both you and us to pluck up such seditious opinions (as had been fostered on both sides) root and branch."—*Bramhall*, new ed. i. p. 42.

"*Until* time should teach the Roman Court to content themselves with moderate things, which *endure long:* or *until* either a free ecumenical council or *Europæan synod* should settle controversies, and tune the jarrings strings of the Christian world."

"*Until* God send us an ecumenical council, or *one as general as might be.*"—*Ibid.* p. 81.

"I confess that (speaking of the corruption which led to the Reformation) this *is most proper for a general council to redress.* Every thing is best loosed by the authority by which it is bound. But in

* Letter of Venetian Ambassador.

case *of necessity*, where there can be no recourse to a general council, every sovereign prince within his dominions, with the advice and concurrence of his clergy, *and due submission to a future ecumenical council*, is obliged to provide remedies for growing inconveniences."—Old edit. p. 216.

Meantime, "they lament with all their hearts the present condition of Christendom; and hold actual communion, *in voto*, with all the divided parts of the Christian world."

"You tell us, to our grief, that 'there is no accommodation to be expected:' the widest wounds are closed up in time, and strange plants, by inoculation, are incorporated together; and is there no way to close up the wounds of the Church, and to unite the disagreeing members of the same mystical body?"—Vol. i. new ed. p. 80.

And Hammond,—

"There cannot be *a more amazing dismal prospect* in the world, than the vast rupture and chasm betwixt the east and west, and the many subdivisions, lesser rents and fractions, which are multiplied infinitely in this western part of it—first cut asunder in the midst, and then so much life secured to each moiety, as to make it capable of the rack and torture in every limb of it, and of continuing for ever howling and laughing at once under these torments, till at length it cannot, without fits of the most phrenetic rage, be besought to come out of this condition. —How can we be more profitably employed, than in wrestling and combating with heaven for this one blessing, this comprehensive donative—this grace beyond all other graces—this duty above all other duties —this utmost pitch of celestial joy—the blessing of Catholic unity?"—*Hammond*, vol. i. p. 568.

Such was their feeling with respect to our state of division; nor did they hold even their points of difference from Rome as settled, fixed points, that *they would never, under any circumstances, yield;* but only—as what their particular judgments maintained conditionally—*until a council should overrule them:*

"Though it be not in the power of any council to make that fundamental which was not fundamental, or that proposition heretical which was not heretical in itself, ever from the days of the Apostles—yet when inferior questions, not fundamental, are once defined by a lawful general council, *all Christians, though they cannot assent in their judgments, are obliged to passive obedience. And they who shall oppose the authority and disturb the peace of the Church, deserve to be punished as heretics.*"—*Bramhall*, new edit., vol. i. p. 111.

"I acknowledge, further, that a general council may make *that revealed truth necessary to be believed by a Christian, as a point of faith, which formerly was not necessary to be believed*, whensoever the reasons and ground produced by the council do convince a man in his conscience: *and who would not rather suspect his own judgment than a general council's?*"—Id. old edit. p. 173.

And together with this greater reasonableness of tone in the controversy with the Roman Church, symptoms, though cautious ones, began to appear of a new language respecting the Reformation and the Reformers. We have already given reasons why the latter should not be very strong or decided. Let any one place himself, in imagination, in that age, and really enter into the situation of our divines, and he must see how unnaturally any very strong definite censure would come from our then bishops upon their own not distant predecessors. A certain time is necessary in any reaction; persons must be doubly sure of their ground before they speak out irrevocably, and it is an irrevocable step, and argues the very last stage of such a movement, when bishop can array himself formally against bishop, doctor against doctor. However, a man must be very slow who waits for such absolute demonstration before he admits of any *turn* in the tide; and insists, before he will let a single word tell, upon Archbishop Laud abusing in round set terms Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and Bramhall calling Jewel a heretic, and in short a whole vituperative chorus in full voice on the subject. It is possible to insinuate without expressly asserting, to blame effects without attacking causes, to praise the whole and to reflect upon the several parts, to censure *natural* consequences under the name of *extreme* and distorted ones. Nor need this be done at all upon set purpose, but is compatible with the utmost simplicity in a writer, it is only an *early stage* of the proceeding—the natural mode of finding fault with a state of things, before its unsoundnesses have been analysed and traced to their original, and the proper relation of events to each other laid bare. The machine is seen to be out of order, and that is all that is seen; the eye wanders vaguely from one wheel to another, and makes undefined and scattered attempts at an explanation; sees this and that action wrong, this and that point affected, but has not yet caught a connected view of the disorder, or referred it to a principle. The development which the Puritans had given to the Reformation, *the whole authority of which* they claimed (and their arguments are very clear and forcible) for their side of the question, seems gradually and unconsciously to have produced suspicions in the minds of our divines, as to the character of that event, suspicions which they showed indirectly and negatively, more than by positive assertion, but still, as we have said, intelligibly enough. The mere circumstance of their having allowed the *word Reformation* to get into the hands of the other party, as if it were their acknowledged property, and to allude themselves to the Puritan movement of their day, as the Reformation—thorough Reformation, and its conductors as the "Reformers,"

" they of the Reformation," and so on, is symptomatic of a *growing* coolness towards the word and the events with which it was associated. A passage from Bishop Sanderson will illustrate what we have said.

" The business of the Reformation was carried on with such mixture of private ends and other human frailties and affections as are usually incident unto the enterprising of great affairs, especially such as cannot be effected without the assistance of many instruments; all of which, in likelihood, being not of one judgment and temper, but having their several inclinations, passions, and interests, *the product of their endeavours must needs be such as the constitution of the most prevalent instruments employed in the work would permit it to be. The very name of reformation of religion and manners and of abuses crept into the Church or commonwealth, carrieth with it a great deal of outward glory and lustre, filling the hearts of men with expectations of much happiness to ensue, and, in that hope, is ever entertained with general applause by the vulgar sort.* Reformation is so much talked of in these days of ours, wherein thousands of well meaning people have been seduced into dangerous by-paths by that *specious name*, it will not be amiss to prompt the reader to some considerations that may *incline him rather to suspect a thing to be ill done, than to be confident that it is well done, if he have no other reason of that confidence but this, that it is pretended to be done by way of reformation.*

" It is considerable, first, that reformation is the usual vizard wherewith men of insatiable avarice or ambition disguise their base, unworthy intentions, that the ugliness thereof may not appear to vulgar eyes. Seldom hath any sacrilegious and seditious attempt appeared abroad in the world, and been countenanced either by *the great ones* or the many, which hath not been ushered in by this piece of hypocrisy. Not to look further backward or forward for instances in both kinds than to the reign of that king (Edward VI.) wherein the statute so much insisted on (the one for issuing episcopal summonses in the king's name, which Sanderson was indignant at) was made, it cannot be denied that during the reign of that religious young king such sacrileges were acted, and that under the name and pretence of reformation, as have cast a very foul blemish upon our very religion. *By what was done in those times, (ill enough*, yet modestly in comparison of what hath been done in ours,) we may have a near guess what their meaning is that are so eagerly set upon a *thorough reformation*, as they call it.

" What defects or excesses there might be in the reformation of religion and the Church within these realms during the reigns of King Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth, *it doth not become me neither is it needful to examine;* but sure it is, they that had the managing of those affairs were ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἡμῖν, made of the same clay with other men—*subject to infirmities and passions, and to be biassed with partial affections, and those affections capable to be inflamed with zeal, cooled with delays, enraged by opposition, and allayed by seasonable applications;* and therefore, in this particular of the statute, it is not improbable that the jealousies they had of the papal power so lately ejected might make

them *more abundantly cautious and solicitous to secure themselves there-against than need required.* Verily, *the temper of those times and men, and the reformation made about those times in other countries considered,* we have far greater cause to bless God that in their Reformation in very many things they did not a great deal worse, than to blame them that in some few things they did not a little better than they have done.

"Thirdly, where a reformation is truly intended, there may yet be such error in the choice of the *means* as may vitiate the whole work, and render it blameworthy. The eagerness of most men in the pursuance of such ends as they are fully bent upon, and their pride of spirit disdaining to be crossed in their purposes, and impatient of meeting with any opposition, putteth them many times upon the use of such means as seem for the present best conducing to the ends they have proposed to themselves, without any sufficient care to examine *whether such means be lawful or not. Whether this observation be so fitly applicable to those times of King Edward's reformation as the two former considerations were, I know not,*—I am sure it fitteth but too well to these evil times of ours wherein the pretence of a *thorough reformation* serveth as a foil to set off the blackest crimes that ever the Christian world was guilty of."—*Sanderson's Episcopacy,* p. 81 et seq.

There can be no doubt, we think, that this passage does, as a whole, reflect considerably on the Reformation; the only room for criticism is, as to the degree in which it does so. Certainly when the writer actually comes to the point, and applies his censure to that event, his language is studiously moderate; but what can be the meaning of all those strong animadversions upon *reformation in general,* why should he be so angry with the word, why should the whole idea it conveys to him be so distasteful? It may be said, he was thinking of the Reformation (as it was called) under *Oliver Cromwell,* not of the one under Somerset, and that the *second* was the cause of all his unpleasurable sensations. But that only makes the matter worse; for why should he connect the two together? Why should the idea of the first Reformation so naturally bring on that of the second, if it was not for some resemblance that he felt—felt perhaps unconsciously, and therefore so much the more deeply—to exist between them? Indeed this first Reformation, and this second Reformation, are so mixed and intertwined in the whole passage, that it is difficult to see often which of the two he is aiming at, *i. e.* aiming at directly, for that he has *both* in his eye throughout is quite evident. They alternate—we must be pardoned the vulgarity of the simile—like the stripes on a waistcoat, and create a kind of confusion as to which is which, a jumbling of identities any thing but complimentary to the first of the two mentioned. We say, what occasion was there for carrying on this double aim? Sanderson's argument was only concerned with the first Reformation.

Why introduce the second, why have a duplicate at all? He has simply to defend a departure which the episcopate of his day had made from a Reformation precedent, and had therefore simply to prove that *that* Reformation (the first one we mean) might be departed from, and was not faultless. His introduction of the second Reformation is quite gratuitous. But to proceed—he has to prove that the Reformation was more or less culpable—how does he prove this? by reflecting upon reformation in general as a "*specious name*," or "*vizard for avarice, ambition, unworthy sacrilegious attempts*," and drawing the inference that, with respect to that Reformation statute departed from, we "*ought rather to suspect it to be ill done, than to be confident that it is well done, if we have no other reason to be confident but this, that it was pretended to be done by way of reformation.*" How useful are general terms in expressing one's meaning, especially when there are reasons for avoiding or dealing gently with the particular instance. All these severe expressions are elicited by the name of Reformation, Reformation in general; but when he comes to the application, then we are told that how far they apply to "*the* Reformation during the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Elizabeth, *it doth not become him to examine.*" Perhaps not, at any rate we are unwilling to press hard upon the bishop's sense of propriety on this head. So again, reformations (the *general* again) are carried on with "*pride of spirit*," "*eagerness*," "*impatience*," "*choice of unlawful means*,"—"whether this observation be applicable to *King Edward's* Reformation, *he knows not.*" He knows not! But why should he have made such a point of telling us this, or have taken the trouble to make the supposition at all? We will take the liberty to conjecture, that he *knew* pretty well that "the observation was applicable," but thought it more becoming not to *say* so, except in this modest and euphonous figure of speech. The same moderation and studied civility attends his conclusion, that the Reformers might have done "*a little better* than they have:" after having described them just before as men "*subject to infirmities, passions, partial affections, to be inflamed with zeal, cooled with delays, enraged with opposition*," verily, he continues "the temper of those times, and *men*, and the reformation made about those times in other countries considered, we have far greater cause to bless God that they did not do worse," than that they did not do "*a little better than they have done.*" This concluding clause is quoted by the reviewer as a triumphant one on his side of the question, but he very prudently omits the conditional form by which it is introduced, viz. "*the temper of those times, and men, and the reforma-*

tion in other countries considered," a rather important qualification. It certainly makes a difference, whether we say, "We have got well out of the scrape," or "they treated us very well," and there stop; or go on "*considering* what sort of men they were." We may get well out of a highway robber's grasp, *considering* he is a highway robber, and yet suffer very considerably, both in our purse and persons, by the collision with him. How is such a one? we ask every day—and are told, Very well, *considering*. It must occur to everybody, that the *positive* value of such an answer depends on what it is which is to be *considered*, and how we are to fill up the hypothetical hiatus. For if it is *considering* he has lost a leg, an arm, one or more ribs, has a fever, an epilepsy, an apoplexy, or what not, the question then devolves upon ourselves to decide what positive state of sanity the patient enjoys. "The temper of the *men* considered," Bishop Sanderson thinks, and we think with him, that our Church has got out of the hands of the Reformers very well, and has kept many things that she was in great danger of losing. But at the same time, we do not wish to lose sight of the hypothetical or conditional ground, upon which we maintain such a view of things. It would be absurd to say, that by "the temper of the *men*," Sanderson only meant of the political, as opposed to the theological section of the Reforming party; the "men" being obviously the same that he has been describing as "they that had the managing of these affairs," who were "inflamed with *zeal*," &c. Considering the *foreign Reformation* too—why the greatest impugner of our Reformation might say, that "considering the foreign one," it was very well, nay, most faultless and commendable. A critic ought to remember that hypotheticals and conditionals are not mere figures of speech, or ornaments of composition, but substantial ingredients in any assertions in which they occur, and so intended to be by those who use them.

Bramhall takes Sanderson's view, and talks of the "*improper expressions—the oily expressions of flatterers of King Edward VI.*" The following, from Laud, we quote as instancing the same tone of restraint that we observed in Sanderson:

"Reformation, especially in cases of religion, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many pretensions, that 'tis almost impossible but the Reformers should step too far, or fall too short in some smaller things or other. But if there have been any wilful and gross errors, not so much in opinion as in fact (*sacrilege too often pretending to reform superstition*), that's the crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation; *and they are long since gone to God to answer for it, to whom I leave them.*"—*Conf. with Fisher*, p. 100.

The difficulty, however, which they feel in making admissions,

enhances the value of them as *indexes of their own feelings*—*e.g.:*

"For that which first caused, and now continues, the loss of unity in the Church of Christ, as I make no doubt but that *the pride of men is one cause*, so yet cannot I think that pride is the adequate and sole cause thereof. But in part *pride caused it, and pride on all sides; pride in some that would not at first, nor will since submit their private judgments, when with a good conscience they may and ought;* and pride in others, that would not at first, nor will yet mend, manifest, great, and dangerous errors, which with all good conscience they ought to do. But 'tis not pride not to submit to known and gross errors: and the definitions of some councils (perhaps the Lateran, Constance and Trent) have been greater and more urgent causes of breach of unity, than the pride of men hath been; *which yet I will never excuse, wherever it is.*"—*Conference with Fisher*, p. 235.

The character that we have pointed out in these extracts runs through a great number of testimonies, as we must really call them, against the Reformation, that proceed from the writers of this school. There is a perpetual disguise kept up, a disguise which they were hardly conscious of themselves: their remarks have a *medium*, at which they primarily stop; but we have only to *apply* this medium, and they strike home instantaneously. Heylin, for example, does not allow himself to condemn Cranmer and his associates *themselves;* but the divines whom they chose for their standards, *and under whose influence he himself describes them as acting*, he condemns without hesitation.

"Now for the alteration of the Liturgy, which did indeed draw with it a full and final alteration of the thing now talked of, *you take great pains to make it visible unto the world that Calvin had no finger in it. It had been happy for this Church if he and Beza could have kept themselves to their meditations*, and not have been *curiosi in aliená republicâ*, as they were too much."

He then proceeds to say that he (Calvin) was the person who—

"Excepted against the commemoration of the dead, which he acknowledged however to be very ancient, as also against chrism, and extreme unction. He said he wished *illa omnia abscindi semel*, that all these ceremonies should be abrogated, and that he should go forward to reform the Church without fear or wit; without regard to peace at home, or correspondency abroad! I writ, saith he, to the Duke of Somerset to the effect that there was no hope but that the Papists would grow insolenter every day, *unless the difference were composed about the ceremonies.* Composed and how? not by reducing the opponents to conformity, but by encouraging them rather in their opposition, especially by supporting Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, the principal leader of that faction, and very zealous amongst other things against the altars."

By such influence as this, he continues, it is "*that we have seen the alteration of the Liturgy*, and by that alteration a change of altars into tables for the Holy Sacrament," and he concludes accordingly—

"That leaving the word altar out of the Communion Prayer Book last established, and other alterations which were made therein, grew not from any scandal taken at the altars by the country people, but by a dislike *that Calvin* had conceived against the Liturgy.—You cry out without a cause that it was the king, the lords, or the state that made this alteration in the Liturgy. An alteration there was made by the king and the state, but by the *incitement of Calvin, that Polypragmon.*" —*Heylin, Holy Table*, p. 110, *et seq.*

Thorndike speaks to the same effect.

"I will not say there cannot, nor did not consist any reformation in laying this ceremony aside. (He is speaking of the sign of the cross.) But I will say, as of prayers for the dead, *we know well enough whom there was a desire to content, when this ceremony in the Eucharist was laid aside*, which seeing it hath not served the turn, and so much the more is demanded by them that would be thought reformed, I think myself obliged to maintain this point, as I do the rest."—*Epilogue*, vol. iii. p. 342.

And again, alluding to the same influence,

"I did never imagine that the humour of reforming the Church, without ground or measure, *may not proceed to that extremity, that it had been better to have left it unreformed.* I say not that this is now come to pass, *comparisons being odious;* but this I say, that he who goes to reform the Church upon supposition that the Pope is Antichrist, and the Papists therefore idolaters, is much to take heed that he mistake not the ground of that measure by which he is to reform, and taking that Reformation which is the farthest distant from the Church of Rome that is possible, *imagine that the Pope may be Antichrist, and the Papists idolaters, for that which the Catholic Church and faith alloweth.*"—*Conclusion to Epilogue.*

Is it or is it not blaming persons to say, that they voluntarily chose and acted under the worst influence? By the way, Heylin is more direct in his censures upon the prior race of Reformers, the Albigenses, Wickliff, and the rest, those "precursors of the Reformation," who ushered in the first dawn, introduced the first rays of Gospel light, &c. He speaks very decidedly of the whole class.

"The fautors of the Church's invisibility have beat their brains to find out a Church agreeing in all points with the Protestant tenets before Luther's time. Luther pleased to place the Church in a certain remnant of men whom the world took no heed of, who were indeed the people and the Church of God, though not so accounted. And Calvin hides the same in uncertain corners, where God did wonderfully preserve

it from the sight of men. But this not giving satisfaction to the common adversary, who press upon us with the question, *Where was your Church before Luther?* a pedigree thereof was fetched from Wickliff, Huss, the Albigenses, the Pauperes de Lugduna, and I know not whom. But this, in my opinion, will not do the deed. As for Wickliff, Huss, and the Albigenses, though they held some opinions which the Protestants do, yet they held many others which the Protestants do not, some, I am sure, *which are as much abominated by the Church of England as the extremest dregs of the Church of Rome.* Nor can we prove the visibility of our Church from them from whom we neither receive our baptism nor our priesthood, nor our form of worship, nor any outward rite or ceremony, nor any thing, for aught I know, whereby we claim the name of a Christian Church. Our Church was, before Luther, where it hath been since—in Germany, France, England, Italy, yea, and in Rome itself; a sick Church then, but since, by God's grace, brought to more perfect health. That the Roman Church is a true Church, though not *the* true Church, no sober Protestant will deny."—*Heylin on Creed*, p. 393.

Nor does he at all hesitate, with respect to some of the subordinate Reformers, to speak of "Tyndal's heterodoxies," "Frith's high-flying conceits," Lambert's presbyterianism, &c. As for the foreign Reformers, a censure upon them is *implied* all along, in *regretting* their influence upon our own; nor need we cite such expressions as, that

"*Luther revived the error of the Manichees*, in denying all freedom of the will; and *Calvin revived the errors of Bardesanes and Priscillian*, in charging all men's wicked actions on the stars and destiny, not positively, but *tantamount;* ascribing that to the inevitable decrees of Almighty God, which Bardesanes ascribed to the powers of fate.—If we grant this doctrine to be true and orthodox, we may do well to put an *index expurgatorius* upon the creed, and *and quite expunge the article of Christ's coming to judgment;* for God doth never punish his own actings in us."—*Heylin's Tracts*, p. 507.

"*Of Luther and Calvin*," says our contemporary, "*our great divines uniformly speak with respect.*" We had really thought that our Church had protested pretty strongly, at any rate, against the latter, and did not expect to see the name of Calvin held up to respect in such a quarter. He proceeds, however, to give some passages in his favour from our Calvinistic divines, also one from Bishop Sanderson, with the common wind-up, "*And yet were they not men*—might they not in many things, did they not in some, mistake and err?" We need say no more to stamp such a quotation. It is really miserable to see a churchman in the present day *interceding for Calvin*, and begging us to show him respect.

Bishop Montague adopts the same line of *courtesy*, as the rest, and *excuses* the Reformers.

"Our predecessors *spake vehemently, indeed hyperbolically, against images.* For the people, with whom they then dealt, were by all means to be preserved from the taint and tincture of their superstitious practices. And for this cause, I say, *the Church governors of those times in their popular sermons took that course which the ancient fathers did, and stretched their exhortations and enforcements, as also their dehortations, somewhat hard upon the tentors.*—*Appeal*, p. 264.

Then the complaints that we hear so often of the heat and violence of *both* sides—

"I desire recrimination may not be used," says Hammond; "for though it be true that Calvin hath done it, *and the Church of England a little* (*which is a little too much*), for *negare manifesta non audeo, et excusare immodica non possum*, yet she confessing she may err, is not so chargeable with any fault, as those who pretend they cannot."—*Hammond*, v. 2, p. 564.

And defending Grotius's labours for a reconciliation between the Churches, he says—

"They were designed to show a way to peace, whensoever men's minds on *both sides* should be piously affected to it: [but that] he did not hope for this temper in this age, the humour on both sides *being so turgent*, and the controversy debated by those *on both sides*, who *desire to eternize* contentions."—*Ibid.*

Is not this somewhat of a reflection on such *fierceness of tone* as we find in Jackson—

"This admits no terms of parley *for any possible reconcilement.* The natural separation of this island from those countries wherein this doctrine is professed, shall serve *as an everlasting emblem of the inhabitants' divided hearts*, at least in this point of religion. Let *them, O Lord, be cut off speedily from among us, and their posterity transported hence; let no print of their memory be extant so much as in a tree or stone within our coast—who will not imprint these and the like wishes in their hearts, and mention them in their prayers.*"

Language which our contemporary actually quotes for our admiration.

Or take that whole class of censures, which assail so indignantly the sacrilege, spoliation, violence, and profaneness, with which the Reformation was accompanied. It may be said, of course, that these were the *accompaniments* of the Reformation, and that to attack them is not to attack the event itself. Be it so; nevertheless, to *dwell* upon these accompaniments, to *associate* the idea of them with the event itself, to have no *wish to gloss them over*, and feel no *restraint* in speaking of them—this vituperative turn, so prevalent, as Mr. Hallam says, in the Caroline period, is a sign which a politician would call dangerous, and indicative, if not of disaffection, at any rate, of feelings toward

the great epoch somewhat weakened, and ties somewhat relaxed. We need hardly appeal again to Spelman's open-mouthed denunciations on the subject :

" *I am now come off the rivers into the ocean of iniquity and sacrilege*, where whole thousands of churches and chapels, dedicated to the service of God, in the same manner that the rest are which remain to us at this day—were, by King Henry VIII., in a temper of indignation against the clergy of that time, mingled with insatiable avarice, sacked and rased as by an enemy."—*History of Sacrilege*, p. 182.

And his list of divine retributions on the abettors of these proceedings begins thus—

" 1. The Lord Cromwell, vicegerent for the king in the spiritualities, was beheaded the 28th of July in next year."

" 2. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, D. D., was burnt in the Castle ditch, at Oxford, 21st March, 1556, 3 Mary."—Ibid. p. 196.

It is worth observing, too, how their mode of speaking of the sacrilege and spoliation which went on at the Reformation *connects it with the religious spirit* developed by that event; a connection which brings such animadversions into very near contact with the Reformation itself. How strongly does Faringdon speak :

" Time was when this was accounted an holy language, and holy men of God and blessed martyrs of Christ spake it. Then it was not superstition but devotion. *And no other language was heard till the days of our grandfathers. But then covetousness, under the mask of false zeal, swallowed up this devotion in victory, led it in triumph, disgraced and vilified it, and gave it an ill name. Then the devil showed himself in the colours of light, and did more mischief than if he had appeared as a roaring lion. Then the very name of holy was a good argument to beat down a temple;* which must down for this, because it was called so. Before this, there were holy means, and they were called so—the Word, Prayer, Sacraments, Ecclesiastical Discipline, &c."—*Faringdon's Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 17.

And again :

" That God by dust and ashes should be served in dust and ashes; that decency should be confined to yours, and find no room in the house of God; this is the decorum which those who call themselves spiritual men would observe, that luxury should dwell in state, devotion in a cottage. In which they show so little of the Christian, that nothing appeareth of the man. Who can account what is laid out in this kind to be unnecessary waste ? God dwelleth in the beauty of holiness. I will not show you the face of antiquity, for we must either fling dirt at it, or else hide our own—*either censure our forefathers' too much devotion, or be ashamed of our own miserable neglect and profaneness.*"—*Sermons*, vol. ii.

But another and more penetrating class of objections struck immediately, positively, and decisively at the Reformation itself; speaking of it in the light of *a failure*, a complete falling short of its own declared objects, not necessarily indeed, from the nature of the case, but as having *proved* such, as having *turned out* so, as having, in *point of fact*, not done what it started with professing to do. It was too plain that Church discipline had *not* been reformed and brought back to that stricter and more primitive model, which it had been the declared purpose of the Reformation to restore it to, that evil men were still tolerated within her pale, and Church-membership, in short, in as lax and corrupt a state as ever, only with the additional evils of confusion and schism, and some portions of discipline given up, that had been in use before. Thus the law of private confession once a year, had been abolished *with a view to the revival of public penance*, but the latter never came. And, therefore, says Thorndike,

"I must freely glorify God by freely professing that, in my judgment, no Christian kingdom or state can maintain itself to be that which it pretendeth more effectually, than by giving force and effect *to the law of private confession once a year.* Not that I do condemn that order which the Church of England at the Reformation contented itself with, to leave it to the discretion and conscience of those who found themselves burdened with sin, to seek help by the means of the pastors, as appeareth in the communion service; *but because I see the Church of England to have failed of that great piece of reformation which it aimed at in this point—to wit, the reviving of public penance* (mentioned in the commination service).—*Epilogue*, b. iii. p. 104.

Again:

"It is true it was *an extraordinary act of secular power* in Church matters to enforce the change without any consent from the greater part of the Church. But if the matter of change be restoring of laws which the primitive orders of the Church make requisite, the secular power acteth within the sphere of it. Well had it been, had that most pious and necessary desire thereof to restore public penance been seconded by the zeal and compliance of all estates, and not stifled by the tares of Puritanism growing up with the Reformation.—*Conclusion to Epilogue*, p. 423.

He proceeds to say that the mere "suppressing of an old state of things was "no just pretence for a reformation," unless a better state was introduced in its place; and therefore asserts, that "the communion of the Eucharist, being the chief office in which God's public service consists, *the abolishing of private masses is an insufficient* pretence for reformation, where that provision for the frequenting of the communion," which preceded the

practice of private masses, is not restored. On which ground it was that he made, in the interval before the Restoration, the proposal for an alteration of our Church system, which Clarendon objects to.

"Where this unity is once broken in pieces and destroyed, and palliating cures are out of date, the offence which is taken at showing the true cure, is imputable to them that cause the fraction, not to him who would see it restored. *For what disease was ever cured without offending the body that had it?* (here the Church of England). The cause of Episcopacy and of the Service is the cause of the whole Church, and the maintenance thereof *inferreth the maintenance of whatsoever is Catholic* (i. e. though not contained in, nay, *going beyond* the Church formularies as they stood.) *Owning therefore my obligation to the whole Church, notwithstanding my obligation to the Church of England, I have prescribed the agreement thereof* (*of the Church universal*), *for a boundary to all Reformation.* While all English people, by the laws of the Church of England, had sufficient and probable means of salvation ministered unto them, it had been a fault to acknowledge a fault, which it was more mischief to mend than bear with. But when the unity that is lost may as well be obtained *by the primitive truth and order of the Catholic Church, as by that which served the turn in the Church of England,* (because it served to the salvation of more), I should offend good Christians to think that they will stand offended at it."—*Preface to Epilogue.*

With respect to the foreign Protestants, it is quite true that their professions of Church principle and respect for episcopacy, their want of which they excused on the plea of pure necessity, induced our divines to acknowledge them, in a loose, vague way, as Churches: but to do so went obviously against their principles. Bishop Andrewes lays down very clearly, in the first instance, that there can be no Church without a bishop. The foreign Protestants complain, and *then* he allows a modification—that, as a *fact*, he sees Churches standing without them—but he is *driven* to it before he makes it. And even then, it is plain, all he wants to express is something considerably lower than the idea of a Church: "he must be made of iron, *that denies them salvation.*" He wants to express a kind of *intermediate* state, between being Churches, and being absolutely out of the pale of salvation; and, having no intermediate term, he allows them to be in a manner Churches.

Bramhall, in allowing them to be Churches (though incomplete), without bishops, does so expressly on the understanding of their *strong desire* to have them, and the *acknowledgment of their deficiency* without them—and on that understanding *alone.* Of those who have "*not* this desire or esteem of episcopacy, but condemn it as an anti-Christian innovation," he says, "*I conceive theirs to be most gross schism.*" And would he have been more

lenient to *a latitudinarian indifference* to it? But is not this the state of feeling among the continental Protestants *now* upon the subject? It is surely hypocrisy to excuse the latter on the plea on which our divines excused them, when they no longer *make* that plea; when they no longer *profess* their deficiency. The Presbyterians of Scotland came *literally* under Bramhall's case of schism; and have the Protestants abroad at all more ecclesiastical feelings on the subject? Is fanaticism worse than indifference? If it is not, then the latter came directly under Bramhall's own *exception* to his own *concession*—under the very clause *of disqualification* as Churches. The Church, however, we find, under Laud, had gone some way in shaking off such a connexion:

"The king's letters patent for raising subscriptions for the Palatinate, contained 'a passage which gave him (Laud) no small cause of offence—first, because *the religion of the Palatine Churches it declared to be the same with ours;* and, secondly, because it called the doctrine and the government of the Church of Rome an anti-Christian yoke:—*with these objections he acquainted his majesty, who thereupon gave order that the said letters-patent should be cancelled.*'"—*Heylin's Life*, p. 306.

And if such was Laud's opinion *then*, what would it not be *now*, when the continental Protestants have shaken off, not only episcopacy, but the *creeds* as well? With what shadow of reason can our divines' indulgence to orthodox bodies, be applied to bodies absolutely without definite creed of any kind—to Sabellians, Socinians, deniers even of inspiration and the Bible miracles—to Rationalists of every grade and shade, united on the ground of mutual indifference to one another's belief? Yes—"*how would Sanderson indeed, how would the martyr Charles, how would Laud—be gladdened with the prospect*" of an union with such bodies! Why, the Reviewer himself calls episcopacy "*that great apostolical ordinance without which Christian communion must fall to pieces, and all heresies spring up!*" Nevertheless, his German Protestants have been a good 300 years without it: it is high time, we suggest, that he should at any rate begin to suspect a few heresies among them.

After the charges of indulgent language to Rome, and disrespect to Reformers and Protestants, the kindred one of attachment to forms and ceremonies is very easily met. When the history of our Church speaks so clearly as it does on this subject, and the authority of our divines is so unanimous, it is really superfluous to cite a single testimony, except merely by way of sample, and to enliven our memory—*e. g.* a page from the life of Laud:

"He began with Canterbury, his own Cathedral, where he found the

table placed at the east end of the choir by the dean and chapter, and adoration used toward it by their appointment: which having found in so good order, he recommended unto them the providing of candlesticks, basons, carpet, and other furniture for the adorning of the altar. And that these things might be perpetual to succeeding ages, he composed a body of statutes, in which was this (which the deans, prebends, and officers, were bound by oath to observe), "*that at their coming in and going out of the choir, and all approaches to the altar, they should, by bowing toward it, make due reverence to Almighty God.*'

"At Winton, he required them '*to provide four copes, to rail in the communion-table, place it altarwise, to bow towards it, and daily to read the Epistles and Gospels at it.*'

"At Chichester, '*to provide copes by one a year for God's public service, till they were sufficiently furnished with them: with the like adorations.*'

"At Hereford, 'that they should officiate on Sundays and holidays *in their copes*—stand at the Creeds, Gospel, and doxologies—bow at the name of Jesus, and toward the altar.'

"At Worcester, such copes as belonged anciently to that church, which had been lent many times to common actors, or otherwise sacrilegiously profaned, he (Dean Manwaring) *caused to be burnt*, the silver extracted, and laid up in the treasury toward buying new ones."—*Heylin's Life*, p. 291.

And so on throughout his province.

"According unto which example of their lord and chancellor, *the principal colleges in Oxon beautified their chapels, transposed their tables, fenced them with rails, and furnished them with hangings, palls, plate, &c.*" —*Ibid.*

For the chapel at Holyrood it was ordained—

"That the copes *which are consecrated* for the use of our chapel be delivered to the dean to be kept upon inventory by him, and in a standard provided for that purpose, and to be used at the celebration of the Sacrament."—*Ibid.* p. 262.

At the coronation of King Charles—

"Finding *the old Crucifix* among the regalia, he caused it to be placed upon the altar, as in former times."—*Ibid.* 144. He restored too the broken crucifix in Lambeth chapel.—*State Trials*, i. 423.

Laud *consecrated* all the furniture of the altar.

"The third witness was one who came into my chapel at prayer time, *when I had some new plate to consecrate for the service of the communion.* This man says, first, *he then saw me bow, and wear a cope.* This is answered. (Laud had explained that both the one and the other were the rule of the Church, though disused.) Secondly, that he saw me consecrate some plate; that in that consecration I used some part of Solomon's prayer for the dedication of the temple, and that in my prayer I

did desire God to accept those vessels. *No fault in any of the three.*"—*State Trials*, i. 424.

We will not cite again the case of the consecration of St. Catherine's Church, so famous in its day, and since then. No one understood better than Laud "that reformation consists not, as Thorndike says, in abolishing, but in renewing and restoring the order of the Catholic Church;" and that the cry of superstition, idolatry, and so forth, against such ceremonial, was commonly little more than a cloak to justify an indolent devotion.

"Abuses," says the latter, speaking of the Roman Church, may have been committed—"idolatry may have come in at the back door."

"But woe to them by whom offences come; and *those who prosecute offences given* (*i. e.* these abuses) without measure, *are they by whom offences come. The charge of superstition is a goodly pretence for abolishing ceremonies. But when the reverence of God's service and the offices of it are abolished, then the service of God itself seems superstitious. To sit and sleep out a sermon or censure a prayer, is more for a man's ease, than to fall down on his knees, to humble his soul at God's footstool*, and to withdraw his mind from the curiosity of knowledge or language to the sense of God's majesty and his own misery. *It is for our ease, but not for God's service, that the ceremonies thereof should be accounted superstitious.*"

We need only refer here to the well-known labours of Bishops Montague and Wren in this department. An appeal to "Laud and our soundest divines" will surely not be rejected by a writer who has so pronounced them, and who sympathizes so deeply with their struggles against the Puritans; though why he should do so, and then desert them on the very *principle* and *ground* of the contest, we leave to him to explain. How will a philosophical contempt for "*bowing* and *crossing*" harmonize with the following.

"'By the sign of the Cross,' says Bishop Montague, quoting the words of Athanasius, 'all magic spells are disappointed, sorcery and witchcraft cometh to nothing, all idols are abandoned and forsaken.' Epiphanius relateth of a Christian young gentlewoman that was quitted from the wanton assaults of a young man by signing herself with the sign of the Cross. And again the same father saith, the magicians and sorcerers prevailed not, for the woman found help in the sign of Christ. *We have also spiritual conjurations*,' saith Chrysostom—'the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the power of the Cross;' though antiquity never gave unto it divine worship, not when God magnified his power most of all *at the use of it.*—'Helen adored the King of Heaven, and not the wooden Cross,' saith St. Ambrose.

"I could tell," continues Montague, "*some experimental effects thereof*

—some experimented effects of my own knowledge. What if upon diverse extremities I have found ease and remedy by using that ejaculatory prayer of our Liturgy, *Per crucem*, &c., and when I said it, what if, to testify my faith, I made the sign of the Cross? It is true, miracles are ceased, but what if this be none? what, if so ceased, that notwithstanding *God can, and may, and will and doth sometimes work miracles in these days*. The Cross of our Saviour, *in the external sign* thereof, being as much vilified and despised by furious Puritans in these days as ever it was by frantic Pagans in those, why may not God, to teach men better manners, and to check this exorbitancy against the sign of our dear Redeemer's death, do now, as he hath done in the days of old, and show some sign and token to magnify the thing so much despised?' "—*Montague's Appeal*, p. 275, et seq.

" We use signing with the sign of the Cross both in the forehead and elsewhere. '*Caro signatur ut anima muniatur*,' saith Tertullian, and so we."—*Ibid.* p. 266.

The charge of the Puritans against Montague was, that he used the sign of the Cross " not only in Baptism" but elsewhere.

" *Not only in Baptism?*" he rejoins: " tell me then, are ye come so far unto the Church of England as to allow signing with the Cross in Baptism? that Popish ceremony, as your forefathers and patriarchs of the Schism were wont to exclaim against it? There is hope you may grow in time, upon better advice, in love and practice *with some of M. Montague's Popery, with the sign of the Cross in the forehead and elsewhere. If it be not superstitious to sign in the forehead, why is it to sign any other part of the body? Why more out of Baptism than in Baptism?* Is one part of the body more subject and liable to superstition than another? the breast, or belly, or arms, than is the forehead? *What hindereth but that I may sign myself with the sign of the Cross in any part of my body, at any time; at night, when I go to bed, in the morning when I rise, at my going out or at my returning home?* The ancient Church so used it *out of Baptism, ordinarily;* and so may we."—*Ibid.*

As it was replied that the early Christians used it to show their difference from the Pagans among whom they lived, he continues:

" *The same reason that moved them may move us to use it more frequently than we are enjoined, more ordinarily than we do. For we live with Puritans and opposite factionists that have the Cross of Christ in as great contempt and despite as ever had Julian or any Pagan.*"—*Ibid.* p. 271.

The Church was certainly in her " *dotage*" when she tolerated and encouraged such language as this.

We have attempted, so far as a series of extracts can do it, to

give the reader a picture of the divinity of the Laudian Episcopate. If it be said in reply that other extracts could be given of a weaker tone, and that they do not often say such strong things as we have quoted, we readily allow it; and at the same time claim them to be judged by what they *do* say, not by what they fall short of saying. *The character of the Laudian episcopate cannot be mistaken;* history does settle some points, and it has settled that for good. We may appeal to the authority of Dr. Hampden, and the author of "Essays on the Church." The former distinctly identifies the cause of Tract 90 with the genius of the Laudian school, when he calls it exactly the same attempt that Santa Clara and Bishop Forbes made. The friendly feeling of that school for Santa Clara and his class of writers has already appeared; and Bishop Forbes was himself a member, and a very prominent one, of the Laudian party, and as good a representative of it as we could have. Or what says the straightforward author of "Essays on the Church," speaking of our standard theology, "We want the works of those who founded and built up our Church; but they offer us those only *who tried their utmost and partly succeeded in pulling it down*"—a distinction between those divines and our reformers, which (apart from the terms in which he expresses it) we are quite willing to accept; and hope that the Parker* and the Anglo-Catholic libraries will be satisfied with their respective grounds. We have an Anti-Tractarian lecture before us at this moment, the author of which, taking his cue from the Quarterly reviewer, claims, forsooth, the authority of our divines for his own low-church views; but he amusingly forgets his lesson after a certain point, and throws aside the Caroline divines under the name of "*Laud and his faction.*" Whom, then, we ask, does popular opinion, whom do the unconscious testimonies even of our opponents point out as the representatives now of this "faction?" Clearly not the evangelicals, clearly not our moderate or establishment men—we have yet to learn that the Laudian party was celebrated for its *moderation.* Who are they, then? for certainly a school whose authority our Church has so distinctly recognized, ought to have some representatives; or, if no complete ones, some, at any rate, that are its nearest representatives. Who are these? But we will not press this inference, but proceed to a more practical one.

Upon the plainest historical grounds then, supported by the

* That society, however, has no right to the name of one who was Queen Elizabeth's great coadjutor *in stopping the further progress of the Reformation.* We would suggest to them in preference the title of the Hooper Society, or the Genevan Institute.

testimony of popular opinion at the present day, we have the fact established of a change in our Church theology—a change since the Reformation—the development of a standard divinity in a later age, different from the standard divinity of a former. Calvin and his school were the master spirits of the Reformation; they gave the impulse, and *they* left a stamp upon the movement which cannot be mistaken: let history for once be allowed to speak. The full development of Calvinism was stopped indeed, but only because the *Reformation itself* was stopped, and its peculiar doctrines remained the theology of our Church *till Laud upset them.* Let us hear no more of the sure middle ground which the English Church has kept from the first—we are too glad to have had such a ground—*but instead of being the ground of the Reformation,* it was a *reaction* upon it. Let us hear no more of a full born, settled, whole, perfect system of Reformation divinity, fixed as the everlasting hills, unvarying as the course of the stars, of our meridian light, "uniform definiteness, consistency of teaching, which has been so remarkable." Every one who knows the history of our Church knows that this is not the case; not only has her divinity altered, but her individual divines show signs of a change and advance as their inquiries proceeded—sometimes even in the course of the same work (e.g. Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity), showing clearly that their theology was just, what it is asserted *not* to be, a *gradual formation.* Why carry on then a perfectionist language which cannot be supported by fact? Why uphold a mere *view,* a pretty solacing theory, when the first breath of history must send our bandbox hypothesis to the winds? Why not confess, what harm can there be in acknowledging the truth, that ours was in spirit a Calvinistic Reformation, and that a noble episcopate afterwards reclaimed us? If the one fact be humiliating, the other is a counterbalance to it—and our Church, between them both, would stand where she now stands.

And can it be denied that as the Church threw off her Calvinism, she also began to incline to a union with Rome: i.e. if we are to take, as we must do, the Laudian school as her then representatives? But we will only proceed at present on the fact that she did throw it off—that there has been a *change* in our theology since the Reformation. For if the precedent *has been set,* why may it not, with prudence and moderation, be *followed?* If our Church has changed her tone and language on various points, why may she not again, when circumstances demand, i.e. when the circumstances under which she spoke have themselves changed? But this—we began and we end with asserting it—

this is just what the Quarterly reviewer would not have us do. The state of things, under which our divines wrote, encouraged a peculiar language against Rome: therefore they would have used the same language when that state of things had passed. The relations of Church and State are altered, but the Church must speak exactly of the State as she did two centuries ago, and continental Protestants have grown into Latitudinarians and Rationalists; never mind, she must speak exactly the same of them as she did when they were orthodox. Nay, if they were to turn Jumpers or Mormonites on this principle, we should still have to do the same; and "Sanderson" and the "Martyr Charles," and the "blessed martyr Laud," would be represented as "joying with a joy" indescribable at our approaching enlargement. But why, in the name of common sense, is the Church of England to be debarred from looking facts in the face, and seeing things as they are? It is the function of life, whether in the individual or a community, to discover the *real*, the *actual*, in their position: the glazed eye has one vacant stare for every passing object; but the living one *observes*, distinguishes, catches each change, and sees from moment to moment each successive world that forms around it. A parrot's salutation deceives our ears the first time, for who can tell whether Tom or John may not really be passing, but the twentieth repetition of it very soon betrays its irrational origin. In the same way it is only a sign of proper life in a Church, when it can *see facts*, catch the realities of its position, and resolve how to deal with them. She is not the mere relic of bygone times, the repository and mausoleum of what has been said and done before: she herself *is* what she has been; is so really—not commemoratively only—a *living* body, we mean; with that in her upon which she can act for herself, and which gives her the right and the power to meet rising events, as to her, the living Church, seems best. She has a gift within her and should stir it up; should she neglect it for idolizing a mere routine, or customary mode of speaking, the churchman will have need to be alarmed: surely he will think there is something to be done: times are changed and changing, the ground from under us is giving way, the world threatens and requires energy, heresy undermines and demands zeal and watchfulness: we look to her whom we have looked up to from our birth, as our monitress and guide, and we see her by our contemporary's wand turned into a stiff stone like figure, with eyes fixed, and lips repeating mechanically, Popery, Popery: before her pass the powers of darkness in dread array, and form after form of unbelief, heresy and schism, the carnal, extravagant, subtle, worldly

—she stares vacantly upon each, and again and again says, Popery: we begin to apprehend something, and the awful thought suggests itself—has she life, is she a real being; or have we been hitherto, as oriental stories describe, within the circle of some magical spell, and been hanging on the lips of an idol or a phantom?

But however bound we may be to the stationary line, the difficulty is not quite over yet, for what is to be done where the Church herself formally and solemnly expresses her wish *not* to be stationary, but to change, as she does every Ash Wednesday in the point of discipline. Our contemporary cannot of course, on his own stationary principle, wish this language to be given up. So we presume the Church is to go on having no discipline, and also to go on formally expressing her regret at having none. Both of these are of course to go on side by side for ever; discipline being popish, it is quite proper that our Church should have none; but then orthodoxy having attached a sort of disciplinarian idea to a Church, it is quite proper, and a nice liturgical arrangement, that she should be sorry for the deficiency. This must, we say, be our contemporary's view, for we observe that on every occasion on which he alludes to the subject of improvement wanted in our Church, whatever points he may mention, and he mentions many, in which we need it, he always in the most marked and decided way omits *discipline*. "We want more bishops, more clergy, more individual piety, more missionary exertions," and so on—not more *discipline*. A professed follower of our divines could not have made a more unfortunate omission. If there is any one point on which they are all agreed it is this: even Burnet, even the lax theologians of 1688, could talk about discipline. So here is a point of the utmost importance, which we have notoriously neglected, and the neglect of which our Church herself has lamented and does lament still; and yet we have grand lines of Church improvement drawn out, *without even once mentioning it.*

So much for the perfectionist language we are so fond of: and yet how quickly does it disappear as soon as ever we get out of the sphere of ceremony, and are allowed access to a person's real mind. Our opponent, for example, will admit a great deal, if you will let him do it *under the rose;* he only thinks that "if we do suspect defects in this admirable system, it will be wise '*to shut up all such questions from the young, and deliberate of them only in secret with the old*'"—a rather bold assertion of the doctrine of *reserve.* And yet it is notwithstanding in the pages of our contemporary that we see it asserted, that "if any thing

could have tempted them (our divines) to waver in their faith and allegiance, it must have been *the state into which England was thrown when the yoke of Popery was shaken off* (*by the weakness which that yoke caused*), *and which has been perpetuated more or less ever since.* They did not witness as we witness *a new spring tide of piety*," &c. "Within the last *ten years* she has roused herself, *like one that has been paralysed, from a bed of sickness.*" Are the last *ten years* then the only part of her career that the Quarterly reviewer can look to with satisfaction? If so he is certainly no blind eulogist of his Church, nor can there be so very much fault to find with the "Oxford movement," which happens to have been exactly coincident with that period, and has certainly been a somewhat prominent feature of it.

And now from the religion of the Church of England to turn to another, not quite so important, but still very curious and knotty point—the religion of the Quarterly reviewer—what is it, for a more remarkable compound we never met with. He has a peculiar faculty of believing a thing, and believing its opposite at once, which does not fail to impart a labyrinthal grandeur and richness to his creed. Thus he extols our divines who stuck out for Church ceremonial, but thinks people at the same time doting and silly who do so: on the other hand he hates the Puritans, but finds fault with those who speak against them, and wants us to respect Calvin. He thinks there is much good in Romanism, and that it has been abused too much, also that it is our great enemy, and never can be thought too ill of. He thinks that the bishops' tribunal is higher than that of kings, and yet that kings have a right to depose bishops—and a good deal more of the same kind. We doubt not the reviewer's ability, sincerity, and good intentions; but is it too much to ask that before he condemns the religion of others, he should first have decided on his own?

ART. III.—*Select Treatises of St. Athanasius, Archbishop of Alexandria, in Controversy with the Arians, translated with Notes and Indices.* Part I. (Being Vol. VIII. of Library of the Fathers.) Parker: Oxford.

THERE are many causes which induce us to hail with peculiar pleasure the appearance at the present time of any work tending to call the attention of the Christian public to the subject of *doctrine*. The *duty* of a Christian (as distinguished from his gifts and privileges) may profitably be contemplated according to the well known division of *faith* and *obedience*. In the latter is included of course repentance and devotion; and in the former is included (though more is also included) *knowledge* of the great Christian doctrines. Christian precepts and Christian doctrine—these are the two great external facts which essentially claim the Christian's attention and allegiance. Other studies, however profitable, even the religious study of Holy Scripture; much more its *critical* examination, or the knowledge of Christian antiquities, or of Church history, or our own formularies; still more again the evidences of religion, or the geography of the Holy Land, or the harmony of sacred with profane history—no part of which latter class indeed has any pretension to be considered any part or parcel of theology at all;—but *all* these, except so far as they are contained in one of the two first named classes, are no *essential* parts of the Christian's knowledge. "Many barbarous nations," says St. Irenæus, "believe in Christ without written memorial diligently preserving the old traditions:" without reading Scripture or knowing a word of it, men *may* be good Christians; without obeying Christ's commandments and believing in His doctrines, they *cannot*. And the Church from the first has acted upon this principle. She has never thought of authoritatively determining the sense of any one text of Scripture, however sacred.* She has excommunicated those, and those only, who were sinful in life or heretical in doctrine. Her determinations on the latter point have been moreover mainly divisible into two classes (which will be a further confirmation of the truth which we are stating); those, namely, which refer to the mode of God's being, so far as He has thought fit to reveal it, and those which refer to the inward life of Christians, to His presence in the souls of His faithful people.† Nor must we omit to observe how exactly

* Thus the Editor of the present volume observes (p. 120, note *p.*), "Even here where the Arians agree with the Catholics, they differ in this remarkable respect, that they place *certain interpretations of Scripture* under the sanction of an anathema."

† For instance, although the inspiration of Scripture and the infallibility of the universal Church, are pre-supposed in the whole Church system, (for the Church draws her decrees pro re natâ from Scripture, and claims to draw them infallibly,) still we must all have been struck with the sparing mention made of them in Church decrees.

our own Prayer-book follows in the same track. In the baptismal service the godfathers and godmothers are exhorted to teach the child, as he grows up, what a solemn vow he has made; to call on him to hear sermons; and *chiefly* to learn the *Creed*, the *Lord's Prayer*, and the *Ten Commandments; doctrine, prayer, duty.* And in like manner in the "Visitation of the Sick," "for as much as after this life there is an account to be given," the sick person is examined, first, whether he believes the articles of the Creed, which is then and there rehearsed; and next, whether he "repent him truly of his sins." In all this, not a word of even the study of Scripture as being any part of the ordinary and essential duty of a Christian.*

But of these habits, obedience, namely, and belief in Christian truths, (though they doubtless react upon each other in a most remarkable manner, still) it must never be forgotten that the former is the very basis and foundation on which the other must be reared. In no other way than by the habit of strict and anxious conscientiousness, can that faculty be acquired which alone hears God's voice where others hear it not, or interprets His words aright where all hear them. The very first aggression then of those, who labour to revive some degree at least of vital Christianity, (in the room of those gross corruptions and superstitions, which have in these latter days among ourselves overlaid and defaced the primitive and simple truth,) their very first aggression must be upon that strange congeries of notions and practices, of which the Lutheran doctrine of justification is the origin and representative. Whether any heresy has ever infested the Church so hateful and unchristian as this doctrine, it is perhaps not necessary to determine: none certainly has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous. It is not only that it denies some one essential doctrine of the Gospel (as, e. g. inherent righteousness); this all heresies do: it is not only that it corrupts *all* sound Christian doctrine, nay the very principle of orthodoxy itself; though this also it certainly does: but its inroads extend further than this; *as far as its formal statements are concerned* it poisons at the very root, not Christianity only, but natural religion.

* It is not of course implied in the text that in our present circumstances any private Christian could neglect the Sacred Volume without great sin, or without betraying a very unchristian temper; and our Church, in the amount of Scripture appointed for the daily service, implies a strong exhortation to its study. But still modern corruptions make it of the highest importance, to define clearly what is and what is not of the *essence* of Gospel requirements. One result at once of what has been said is to show the far higher importance of studying the four Gospels than any other part of Scripture; for the careful and habitual contemplation of the scenes there described tends in one way, just as the Church decisions on His nature tend in another, to keep alive and cherish a true idea of the great Object of faith.

That obedience to the will of God, with whatever sacrifice of self, is the one thing needful; that sin is the one only danger to be dreaded, the one only evil to be avoided; these great truths are the very foundation of natural religion: and inasmuch as this modern system denies these to be *essential* and *necessary* truths, yea counts it the chief glory of the Gospel that under it they are no longer truths, we must plainly express our conviction that a religious heathen, were he *really* to accept the doctrine which Lutheran *language* expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss, in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error. Our readers must admit that we have never been slow in acknowledging how much of sincerity and self-devotion there has *in fact* been among those who have embraced this heresy, and to how very great an extent, where that has been the case, individual conscientiousness has neutralized the anti-religious infection. But neither may we forget on the other hand, how miserably also has this same system in its turn crippled and enchained the religious instinct of its victims, and prevented them from carrying that instinct forward to its legitimate development, the Catholic scheme. Hence the inconsistency, both moral and intellectual, which is so surprising a phenomenon among the "evangelicals;" surprising, that is, at first sight, but no longer surprising, when we regard them as possessed really with religious feelings which draw them *to* Christ, but possessed also by a human, traditionary and most unscriptural system, which draws them directly from Him. Hence that feebleness, ambiguity, uncertainty of doctrinal statement, that inequality, unshapeliness, dwarfishness of spiritual stature, which persons at all conversant with Catholic models are so pained and disappointed in finding (with very few exceptions) in what they hear or see of religious Protestants.

Now so long as this system had undivided sway in the religious world, so long as those who aimed at something higher than the mere careless performance of outward and social duties, who thirsted for a life of more extended prayer and more spiritual contemplation, so long as these, speaking generally, acquiesced almost as a matter of course in this scheme of religion, doctrinal discussions were of little importance: the one class exercised but little of specially religious contemplation at all, the other fixed their spiritual gaze not on Him who is without them, but on the supposed marks of His presence within them; on those supposed proofs of a renewed heart, which satisfied them both of the soundness of their creed and the sufficient rectitude of their conduct. But in proportion as these delusions should be dispelled, in proportion as the indolent dreams of both classes should be disturbed by the preaching of repentance, and judgment to

come, and the Great Day, and its trumpet sounding, as if by anticipation, in their ears; in proportion as the great doctrine of justification by works should be made again to assume its rightful place, and the strictness of Gospel requirements again exhibited (raised as they are by so much above the level of Jewish or heathen precepts by how much the indwelling Spirit gives *us* greater strength than others); in that proportion would the importance of strictly accurate doctrine be unspeakably increased. When the perception both of the sinfulness and danger of sin makes it but sorry comfort to look *within*, men begin at last really and without deception to gaze on the great Object of faith without; and if they are to be really Christians at last, it is of the very utmost moment that He be placed before their minds *as He is*, not in some other manner. In their former state of mind, whatever might be their formal doctrine as to His nature, it might and would remain as a caput mortuum unpractical and inoperative; but now it will be energetically realized, and inevitably carried forward to its legitimate moral or intellectual results. They *may* even be carried on through Sabellianism or Nestorianism into the necessary consequence—simple Socinianism; but if, as is most probable, their conscience revolt from this, it will follow that the confusion and perplexity arising from the apparent difficulties of doctrine, will deter them from the habit of fixed religious contemplation altogether, and their spiritual life will be lowered and (by a circuitous course) Protestantized again, as being deprived of an exercise so essentially necessary to its well being.

But there are another description of persons, for whom definite and positive doctrine seems hardly less imperatively required than for those we have already mentioned. Protestantism, as might be expected in a false religion, is opposed not less to our perception of the beautiful than of the good and true; and a counter movement will therefore inevitably be a protest in favour of the former as well as of the latter. But hence follows a very real and serious danger, and one moreover which, we are convinced, is especially imminent at the present time. Men may join the Catholic side, not from the stirrings of their conscience, but from their æsthetical perceptions; and in so far as they have done so, will be among our most dangerous enemies, while within our very camp and contending externally on our own side. They will seek for converts not where they see strict and wary conscientiousness (which we must never forget is the *real* germ of Catholicism), but where there is a kindred taste for external beauty. Earnest, practical, "rough-handed" obedience, which is the habit especially claiming our sympathy and assistance, will be comparatively neglected; while there will be a most serious ten-

dency to tolerate a less severe life as well as a less sound creed, so there be a joint hatred of pews, a joint love of Gothic architecture, and a joint longing for a more Catholic ritual. Let it not be supposed that we are for a moment giving in to that false and shallow philosophy, which would account such things as of small importance; we are convinced that wherever there is scope for a free and natural Catholic development, there they will assuredly be found. Every faculty which God has given us has a legitimate gratification; and the Catholic system, as *being* Catholic, may well be expected in its perfection to supply such gratification. But for the sake of all reality and consistency, let us first secure what is primary; let us not allow ourselves in sympathy with heretics or careless livers, on points which, however important, are but secondary and ministrative. These æsthetical exhibitions, this display of the "*beauty* of holiness," is of such importance as we feel it to be, because it is so closely *allied* to holiness; because it is so intimately subservient to soundness of creed and purity of life: apart from these it ceases to be what it was, and becomes a hollow unsubstantial profane mockery.

Now it may be said, and truly, that the direct medicine for this most fatal disease is to be found in the doctrine of obedience in all its fulness, of repentance, and of judgment to come. Still there seems also a special connection between the fault in question, and the absence of definite doctrine. In natural religion the parallel habit of mind, the vague and as if luxurious feeling of awe and reverence, without an active perception of duty, is, as we all know, remarkably associated with pantheism. Such men when *not* Christians deify nature, and when *born* Christians, it may be on consideration found not altogether untrue to say that they deify *the Church;* so that as in the former case the personal existence of the God of nature is the truth which they need enforced upon their conscience, so in the latter case is the personal existence and attributes of the Lord of the Church. In all cases it is surely far better to give feelings their legitimate scope than to check and seek to extinguish them; and no less surely these aspirations after the beautiful, this perception of the, as if, intolerable prosaicalness of the ordinary course of every-day life, are in themselves good and right. Let the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity be brought before them as the primary object on which they may rest, and then, while they have mystery so deep presented to their faith as may give the very fullest scope to their feelings of imaginative awe, they will also have strongly impressed on their minds the belief in a *personal* God and a *personal* Saviour, Who died for their sins and will judge them at the last day.

In the meanwhile, however, notwithstanding the deep ortho-

doxy and important labours of Bishop Bull and other English writers, any thing much more dreary than have been (at all events until the last very few years) the prospects of dogmatic theology in our Church, it is difficult to conceive. The current opinion of the religious world to this day continues to be, that short of Socinianism, and apart from Pelagianism, there is no really perilous heresy; and so far we may fairly grant to them, that they only do justice to their own principles; that so long as men remain Lutheran, it *is* very little additional evil that they are involved in two or three other heresies besides. On proceeding further to analyze the mode of regarding sacred truths, which, under cover of this principle, has unconsciously possessed their mind, we shall find the encroachments of two especial heresies to have been greater than could have been thought possible, Sabellianism and Nestorianism. The truth of the former accusation is sufficiently obvious: as an illustration of the latter, we may refer to the reception among us, e. g. of Mr. Abbot's writings; but in truth, every one's individual experience will abundantly satisfy him upon the subject. There appears to have arisen lately a reaction, in itself most laudable, against the barren, lifeless, unreal manner in which the four Gospels had come to be read, and an anxiety to place before the Christian the histories contained in them as living and breathing facts. This has been done sometimes as addressed to children, sometimes the poor, sometimes the educated classes; but do we not find in almost all of them a sad lack of reverence, a most lamentable deficiency in distinctly realizing the truth,—Who is the principal Agent in the scenes described? Is He not generally spoken of in such works, not as being God made man, clothed in the full attributes of human nature, but rather, as it has been expressed, as though He were *a* man, one of a class; free indeed from sin, and gifted with a special and peculiar presence of the Deity, but still, if such words may be used, *originating* His words and acts in His *human* character, however they may be thought mysteriously overruled by his *divine*? and this is, in theological language, to attribute to him a human personality, which was the heresy of Nestorius. A very little experience of the religionists of the day, and a very little familiarity with contemporary literature, will, we think, convince fair-minded persons that this is no overcharged picture; nay we must sorrowfully confess that numbers who are most honourably anxious to agree with the Fathers of the Church, who are zealous and even clamorous for "Apostolical order," seem at times sadly deficient in sensitiveness on matters of doctrine, and far from adequately impressed with the unspeakable importance of "Evangelical Truth."

For an example to illustrate more clearly our meaning, (though

we are far from wishing to specify it invidiously,) we may be allowed to refer to Mr. Milman's recent "History of Christianity," and the tone displayed in it where our Lord's personal history is recounted.* As instances where this tone breaks out into the language of *open* disbelief (in His proper Divinity), we may mention the following; though they might be multiplied, we believe, indefinitely, for we have almost taken the first which came to hand. After the murder of St. John Baptist, "*indications* of hostility from the government seem to have *put Jesus on His guard*."—(p. 240.) Our Lord's lamentation over Jerusalem is not to be considered "*merely* as a sudden emotion of compassion, as *the natural sensation* of sadness, &c." "it seems rather a wise and *far-sighted* consideration, &c." "He *might seem* not *merely* to know what was in man, *but* how it entered into man's heart and mind. His was divine charity enlightened by infinite wisdom" (p. 320). Shortly before His Passion, "at every step *He feels Himself* more inextricably within their toils." He "dwells with a profound though chastened melancholy on His approaching *fate*" (p. 300). It may be said that the work, from which these extracts are taken, has been far from extensively popular, and that therefore the instance it is not a fair one. But it is for that very reason we have chosen it; for what has been the general cause of its unpopularity? Surely it is the author's disbelief in some of the Scripture miracles, and not his blasphemous† and revolting language in speaking of our Lord, which has been mainly fatal to the popularity of his work; and we have therefore mentioned it as an example also of the low superstitions connected with the mere letter of Scripture, to which so many of us are now enslaved. We yield, we trust, to none in our zeal for the entireness and completeness of the sacred volume; to question any one of the Scripture miracles or narratives, is, we fully maintain, a miserable and hateful procedure; the doctrine of plenary inspiration can hardly be pressed too far. It is not of their zeal for the sacred volume in itself that we complain (we only wish we could predict its permanency in the school to which we refer), but we complain of its exclusiveness. For at last, "whether is greater the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?" the letter of Scripture, or the very fundamental truths which that Scripture contains? Which, in the view

* In citing individual illustrations, from the very circumstance of quoting them only *as* illustrations of a very widely spread spirit, it is plain that we imply necessarily no *special* blame on the writers themselves. It is quite certain, from the very inadequate degree in which witness has been borne to doctrine in our own days, that many persons are unconsciously in a state of absolute condemned heresy, who yet claim our high respect from their great earnestness and zeal; nay are far superior in such qualities to some of those who may feel it their duty to denounce them.

† *Unintentionally* blasphemous, of course.

of plain reason, is the more dangerous error, that some part of the sacred volume itself be lightly esteemed (wicked and pernicious as that error undoubtedly is), or that of Him to whom the Old Testament points, of whom the New Testament speaks, from first to last, a conception should be formed and propagated infinitely (for it *is* infinitely) below the truth?

And if from popular impressions we turn to individual writers, we shall find no less serious ground for alarm. Archbishop Whately having advocated simple Sabellianism (Logic, Appendix, Article "Person"), proceeds to illustrate the intimate connection between heresies, by his language about our Lord's nature. He parallels our worship of "God in Christ" to Moses's worship of God in the flame of fire" (Sermons, p. 43), and says explicitly "we differ from the worshippers of a graven image, or of a fire in this, the essential circumstance, that *their* worship is unauthorized, presumptuous and vain, while *ours* is divinely appointed But the *kind* of adoration which idolaters pay to their images *so far corresponds to the Christians to our Lord Jesus Christ, that we might very reasonably and intelligibly describe Him by that term* Jesus describes Himself as not only *conveying to us a notion of the Father's character*, but as possessing the Father's power, offices and attributes, and claiming the honour due to the Father Surely therefore, St. Paul, in speaking of this image of the invisible God, must be understood as of an image in which that God was to be adored" (p. 53, 55). "The Scriptures authorize and enjoin us to worship God in Christ; we are taught that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself'—'that the Spirit of the Lord was upon Him'—that 'God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him'—'in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily' God has chosen so to 'place his name' in *the man* Christ Jesus, *so* to dwell in Him and to manifest or declare Himself in Him as to be *in Him properly worshipped*" (pp. 51, 52).* And similar views are even more clearly

* Mr. Blanco White's words are very important to remember: "I took refuge in a modification of the Sabellian theory....and addressed my prayers to God *as appearing in that image* (Christ)....In [this] instance the *devout* contrivance would not bear examination. *Sabellianism is only Unitarianism disguised in words!*" (Preface to Heresy and Orthodoxy, p. viii.) The instinct of the religious mind is indeed the best answer to the Archbishop's sentiment; as a strong instance of what it involves, consider our Lord's prayer to God the Father. Dr. Whately has already ruled, that to suppose that God, when He said "Let us make man," addressed himself to the Son.... approaches very closely to *the Arian Tritheism*" (Logic, Article "Person"); and so our Lord's prayers must either be considered (what we are sure Dr. Whately would repudiate with horror) a sort of unmeaning, and (if we may use such a word in such a connexion) theatrical display, or else (which is always found the practical result) they are taken as the address of *the man* Christ Jesus *to* that God who dwells in Him. The difference of this latter from Socinianism is shadowy and evanescent indeed. We had

exhibited in Dr. Hind's work on "The Three Temples of the One True God," to which Dr. Whately often refers with high praise. Now though there is not a little confusion of ideas in all this mass of unconscious heresy, so much as this is pretty clear, that supposing any baptized Christian to have lived, by special privilege, free from venial as well as mortal sin, and fully possessed by the Spirit of God, the author would consider it as a matter of formal and positive commandment, not of abstract propriety, whether God might not appoint that He should be worshipped in that Christian; and when we have imagined this hypothesis, and supposed further some indefinite and provisional communication of divine "power, offices, and attributes," we shall have formed the whole idea which Dr. Whately thinks deducible from Scripture of our Lord's Divine Nature.

We have entered more at length on the subject of Dr. Whately than the due proportions of our article can justify, for two reasons: first, our deep conviction of the prevalence and extreme danger of these quasi-Nestorian views, and secondly, because the present is a startling instance, though by no means singular, where persons insult Catholic opinion and practices, from their ignorance or rejection of Catholic doctrine. For the fact is, that this exemption by special gift from venial sin is believed by most Catholics to be a privilege appertaining to the Blessed Virgin, as indeed it may, for all we know, have been granted by God to others at different times. Now this *Catholic* belief as to the blessed Virgin is certainly of very alarming propinquity to *Dr. Whately's* belief as to our Lord Himself; and since all Catholics would agree with him in anathematizing any devotions toward the former, which should in any way "entrench upon the incommunicable honour due to Him alone," it follows that we must abandon *either* this pious belief and the religious devotion to the Θεοτόκος connected with it, *or* the heresy advocated by Dr. Whately on His real nature. The Archbishop has chosen the former of these alternatives; but let him at least display candour and toleration towards those who prefer the latter. Let him not accuse others of raising man to the level of God, when *he* may be rather in fault, who brings down God to the level of man.

We may mention briefly two or three other instances, which occur at the moment, of contemporary writers, as giving a further illustration of the deep spiritual darkness which has prevailed amongst us. Mr. Moses Stuart is indeed no member of our

originally written in the text that the Archbishop was Nestorian; we find from a note of the Editor in the volume we are reviewing, which we had marked for quotation, but cannot find at the moment, that this is not strictly the case; the doctrine does not become *strictly* Nestorian unless the *divine* as *well* as human personality be maintained.

Church, but he has appeared in the very front ground in America as opposing Dr. Channing, and his writings are, we believe, a good deal read by English churchmen, whether here or in America. He protests, moreover, very strongly against the German rationalistic theology, and seems to regard himself as altogether safe and orthodox; nor in fairness should we omit to bear witness to the fact, that he writes in a most charitable and gentle spirit. His whole theology is based on denial of the Son's eternal generation, Who, he says, is never called Son "to designate his originating from the Father in His divine nature;"* the latter doctrine indeed he conceives to lead necessarily to, or even in itself to be identical with, Arianism.† A similar view, it is understood, is held in terms by a great number of English dissenters, whom, nevertheless, it is the fashion to call orthodox on the subject of the Trinity; and is indeed virtually held by large numbers among ourselves. On the other hand, the respected Provost of Oriel is cited by Archbishop Whately‡ as considering that "Scripture teaches us to believe in God, who, *as* the Father, hath made us and all the world; *as* the Son hath redeemed us and all mankind; *as* the Holy Ghost sanctifieth us and all the elect people of God!" The incidental testimony to the orthodoxy of our Catechism, displayed in the circumstance that a writer is compelled so materially to alter its wording, in order to make it teach Sabellianism, is no doubt a very consoling feature of the case. We are bound also to add, that in the edition of Dr. Hawkins's Manual now in circulation, the wording is corrected; but he has never, so far as we

* Excurs. 1st, in Commentary on Romans.

† If men would only realize their words *religiously*, as well as draw consequences intellectually, they would readily perceive that this kind of view is virtually identical with Tritheism. Its theological defect is that it omits the sacred doctrine of the μοναρχια. "By the monarchy," says the Editor of these treatises (p. 45, note *h*), "is meant the doctrine that the Second and Third Persons in the ever blessed Trinity, are ever to be referred in our thoughts to the First as the Fountain of Godhead. It is one of the especial senses in which God is said to be one." And he proceeds to cite St. Athanasius in another place, saying, "we are not introducing three Origins or three Fathers, as the Marcionites and Manichees, just as our illustration is not of three suns, but of sun and its radiance." This doctrine, as it is perhaps one of the most pre-eminently practical of all connected with this great subject (as being so great a protection in the *imagination* for the Divine Unity), so has it been perhaps more than most others derided by silly and shallow men, as unmeaning and over subtle. On this prevalence of virtual Tritheism, Mr. Blanco White may be again profitably appealed to. "So it is that, with the exception of a few..all, as I have observed for many years, take the word *God*, in regard to Christ, as the name of a *species*."—(*Heresy and Orthodoxy*, p. 91.) His exception is as remarkable as his statement: "with the exception of a *few*, who in this country are still acquainted with that ingeniously perverse system of words, by means of which the truly scholastic Trinitarians appear (he puts this word in italics) to evade the logical contradictions with which the doctrine of the Trinity abounds" He considers then, from his own personal experience, the patristic and mediæval system to be the only deliverance from the alternative of Tritheism or Socinianism.

‡ Logic, Article "Person."

know, expressed compunction for his former heretical statement, or shown any consciousness of its fatal tendency. But the case of all perhaps most to our point, from the very circumstance of the humble and retiring disposition of the writer himself, and the fact that all his virtues and all his prepossessions would lead him to side with the more orthodox and conservative of his contemporaries, will be the late lamented Professor Burton. It is hardly possible to open any part of his writings without seeing, *e.g.* how deeply he is possessed by the idea, so absolutely fatal to all orthodoxy, that the Incarnation itself is only an essential point of belief, as ministering to the Atonement; a notion which seems to have been in almost all quarters tacitly surrendered for the last two or three years, (possibly from the, as it were, cool, unblushing, daring unscripturalness which would at once plainly appear to be its characteristic, as soon as attention should be drawn to it,) but which Dr. Burton seems unsuspiciously to have inhaled from the very atmosphere he breathed, and to have assumed throughout as a first principle.* Nor, again, can any one look into such a work as his "Testimonies of the Anti-Nicene Fathers," without observing that, though such theories as those we have just alluded to, and others, were rife and in high repute at the very time he wrote, his one object of alarm and dread is simple Socinianism; and that he is far indeed (to say the very least) from throwing himself heartily and intelligently into that deep, harmonious, and, alone of all others, scriptural statement of the doctrine he discusses, which the Church finally sanctioned, and to which testimony is borne by the very writers who pass under his review.

Such are some among the lamentable extravagances which have been maintained in our own time, and that without authoritative censure or protest, by persons of station within our Church. And as the crowning portent of the whole—as though it were not enough to distort the sacred truth in question into any shape, to fritter it away under any form of words, which ingenuity can devise—a writer has at length risen to maintain, that in whatever shape, under whatever form of words, it is still no part of *revealed* truth; that it is but one out of many theories (though it is certainly the one the author himself adopts) which may be innocently deduced from the sacred volume. Such a statement have we lived to see; and for the sake of our good name among the Christian nations of Europe, it is a matter of peculiar interest

* As far as the authority of our own Church is concerned, it is much to be observed, that in the formulary in which doctrines necessary to salvation are far the most pointedly declared as such (we allude of course to the Athanasian Creed), the Trinity and the Incarnation are mentioned and that with great accuracy of detail, but absolutely no direct notice whatever is taken of the Atonement.

to add, that its promulgator is still a clergyman, nay a theological professor, in the English Church. But far more healthful, surely, and far more hopeful, is *his* state of mind, (however miserable even *his* error,) who should zealously proclaim the Socinian doctrine as the only true Christianity, and loudly and energetically declaim against the "idolatry" of professing Christians, than *his** who should defend as a sacred and important principle this position, that it is left as an open question to believers in the Gospel, whether its Author shall be only regarded with gratitude as a *man*, or shall be worshipped as Very *God*.†

What then will be the fit course to be pursued by those, who feel the unspeakable importance, or rather indeed the absolute necessity, of circulating sounder and more accurate views of doctrine, if our Church is to be saved from final and avowed apostacy? We do not say, how are these views to be *proved*, but how to be *made known*? As to *proof*, the fact that one, and absolutely no other, consistent scheme of doctrines has been in possession of the ground from the first, will be sufficient to induce any one undoubtingly to accept them in the first instance, who is not absolutely blinded by pride or prejudice; and when accepted, the spiritual mind will receive daily a fuller and more certain conviction of their truth, from finding in them the only deep and true harmony of the Scripture statements, and its only safe and secure protection from heresies which it abhors. Let religious men, who have escaped from the dominion of Luther, study this system; we have no further fear as to their adopting it.

Now there are two principal methods by which this great system may be brought before men's minds, (though they admit, of course, of being indefinitely intermingled,) the historical and the scholastic. In the former the inquirer is led, step by step, through the successive periods of the Church's existence. From the very early times, when heresy openly professed itself in its true colours, and stood before God and man the avowed enemy of Gospel doctrine, he descends to the period when it adopted all the arts of sophistry, and learnt, by the ingenious use of words and arguments, to simulate the truth. He observes the recoil of contemporary Christians from the spirit of these new teachers; and yet

* We are of course making no personal allusion of a *private* nature, only so much as is involved in the circumstance of a writer having published with his name certain statements.

† It will be to the purpose to introduce a quotation from one of the notes of this edition. St. Athanasius, it appears, in one of his treatises, "mentions one Rhetorius, who was an Egyptian, whose opinion, he says, it was '*fearful to mention.*'" St. Augustine tells us that this man taught that "all heresies were in the right path and spoke truth; which," he adds, "*is so absurd* as to seem to me incredible."—p. 178, note *d*.

the difficulty and anxiety which they display, in their search for argumentative statements which may be brought against them; startled as they are in discovering notions, which they had perhaps themselves innocently and unsuspectingly adopted, carried forward to conclusions, or issuing in a development of character, which they deeply feel to be in radical opposition to the religion of Christ. At length some great doctor arises, raised up (can we doubt it?) by God to this very end, gifted with that piercing sagacity which enables him to track the heresy uninterMittingly through all its windings of logical subtlety and impious evasion, till he drags it, from the covert which it has chosen, into the clear light of day. Then, as the completion of the whole, the Church authoritatively sanctions the definite and formal expression of doctrine, which it shall be henceforth unlawful for the Christian to reject, and which is destined to serve for ever, both as a barrier against the vanquished error, and as the Church's monument of her victory. This, or like to this, is the process which the student of Church history will witness on the subject of one great truth of revelation after another, till that great and wonderful system gradually accrues, our charter and our heritage, and which gives to all lovers of holiness and peace this inestimable privilege, that within the magic circle which it protects, we are saved from the pain of doubt, from the necessity of disputation, and are called upon but to learn and to believe.

The scholastic method, on the contrary, deals not with processes but results. It instructs the student, not by making him acquainted with the opinions of successive heresiarchs and the writings of those who have laboured for the truth, but by placing for him simply that truth itself, and the full, clear, and systematic expression of it, which has been the fruit of those labours. Now it is plain at first sight, that for ordinary persons this is a far preferable course to the other; for this simple reason, that while the full and accurate knowledge of the Catholic dogmatic system should be considered as absolutely incumbent on all *at least* who have in any way the cure of souls, the acquirement of that knowledge by means of personal historical study, would alone be almost the labour of a whole life, even to the retired and diligent student. While at the same time it must be fully confessed, that one who has the means and ability of pursuing the latter course, will grasp the truth with a freshness, life, reality, and depth wholly unattainable by other means. But in fact the alternative is not fairly presented within our Church at the present time, from the unhappy circumstance that we possess no dogmatic treatise to which the student may be securely referred: Hooker's fifth book, however beautiful, is far indeed from presenting the requisite clearness

and fulness of detail; and Bishop Bull's great work is rather controversial and again historical than didactic. We might indeed be expected to refer to other guides in our need; but alas! it is matter of sufficient notoriety, that she, to whom we should naturally turn, our mother in the faith, is regarded even by very many Catholic minds among us rather with distrust and aversion, than with that feeling of regard and affection (*we* should rather say, deep gratitude and veneration) which is her due. This feeling (whatever its grounds and whatever its merits) seems so deeply ingrained in the national mind, that it would be over-sanguine to expect any very speedy revolution of sentiment; and while it lasts, though Rome's most inveterate enemies have never accused her of heresy on the highest points of faith, still it cannot be expected, that unsuspecting confidence shall be reposed in any instrument which comes from *her* armoury.

In the mean time, while there is this wide diversity of opinion in regard to the *later* ages of the Church, there exists (and it is one of our most hopeful symptoms) a general confidence in the earlier centuries; a readiness, nay a zeal, to adopt, as soon as known, the views which *they* entertained of Gospel truth. It is difficult then to conceive any thing better timed and more likely to be valuable, than the publication which we have named at the head of these remarks. The Arian was the first of those great controversies whose effects have remained to the present time; and partly as *being* the first, partly from other incidental circumstances, it was the most perilous and distressing of them all. Then again St. Athanasius, as he was raised up to be the principal witness and antagonist against it, so also is perhaps the most favourable specimen that could be selected from antiquity, both of clear-sighted doctrinal view and of controversial temper. And while the circumstances of his life would make it in the highest degree ridiculous to suspect him of having been a narrowminded, heated, secluded fanatic; while they absolutely compel us to allow him the praise of having been, in the highest sense of the term, pre-eminently a *man of the world*, endowed with singular and piercing knowledge of human nature, and an almost unexampled power, whether of influencing individuals, or of leading forward large masses of men; at the same time, the labours, dangers, and adventures, so impressive to the imagination, through which his zeal for one great doctrine carried him, tends to imprint forcibly on the minds of all the great and unparalleled importance which *he* attached to a class of questions, which even the better sort of persons now-a-days have so lamentable a tendency to disregard or undervalue.

One very important object which we may hope will be sub-

served by this and similar editions of the controversial works of the Fathers, is the just appreciation of Church history. No one can be at all familiar with the stress laid by the Fathers on purity of faith, and the very prominent place which its preservation holds in all the events in which they take part, without seeing that any view of Church history which shall not take as the central point of the figure the orderly, legitimate, and gradual development of doctrine, is really, to use a common comparison, like the play of Hamlet, the part of Hamlet being omitted: or, to take a still lighter illustration, it is like a person looking on a group of dancers, while his ears are carefully closed against the music; the scene presents to him no higher idea than a disjointed series of irregular, unmeaning, fantastic movements; and this, because he is not conscious of the inspiring strain, which gives life, harmony, and reality to the whole scene. Now there are two very different classes of writers who would do well seriously to consider this. The one are those who, like Mr. Milman, make it their very boast that they reduce sacred and ecclesiastical history to the same class with profane; that they measure it by the same tests, and refer it to the same standard. The others are those who, while they look with a far more religious interest on early times, still write as though they thought no higher or holier lessons were to be deduced from them for our guidance, than information on the laws and etiquettes which regulated the mutual relation of bishops; or the days which were appointed to be kept as fasts and festivals, with the precise rules for their observance; or the age at which candidates were admitted to the different orders of the ministry; or other such matters of ritual and temporary observance; points, some of them no doubt of great importance and all interesting in their place, but which cannot be accounted as the principal features of the times in which they are found, without causing our estimate of the scenes which took place to be in the highest degree narrow and perplexed, nor, one would think, (if those times are taken as models for our own,) without causing our notions of religious faith and precept to be stiff, barren, and most distressingly formal.

Nay, without this familiar knowledge of doctrine, the religious ceremonial itself of the early centuries can neither be exhibited in fair colours or adequately defended. Many instances might be mentioned of this; we will select one of very considerable importance, and the rather as it will introduce us to a very interesting specimen of St. Athanasius's style when occupied in doctrinal statement, and also (to use a modern phrase) of his power of *exegesis*. Fleury, the French historian, in the 19th book of his work, quotes from Eunapius, a zealous pagan of the fourth cen-

tury, a very interesting passage, in which he represents contemporary Christians as giving *divine* honours to martyrs. This is, of course, exactly the appearance which the ancient Catholic system would present to those *without* it; and Protestants have, as was to be expected, zealously repeated the charge. "There is but *one* Mediator between God and man," they say, "but the early Christians trusted in *many* mediators." The ordinary controversial answer to this representation is, of course, that if the text in question be reconcileable with the expectation of benefit from the prayers of *living* Christians, so it is also of departed saints; and as matter of argument this reply is felt to be unanswerable. But the more legitimate and satisfactory course is rather to retort the charge; to press home to Protestants that it is *they*, and not the Catholics, who impair the full force of this and similar passages. The Protestant ordinarily, while he, of course, admits our Lord's *Atonement*, still confines His *present* mediatorial functions to the office of praying for Christians (if such a term may be used) and pleading the merits of His passion in their behalf; and while this makes up his whole creed on the subject, we are not surprised that he looks with suspicion on ingenious arguments and explanations, and maintains that as a broad matter of fact, if the early Catholics thought so much of the intercession of *martyrs*, they cannot have thought so much as they ought of the intercession of *Christ*. But, then, it is plain that there are two ways of raising the thought of *His* intercession above any danger of encroachment from the thought of *theirs;* we may elevate our ideas of Him, instead of doing violence to the feelings of trust and veneration which we should entertain towards *them*.

It appears from several of the notes in this edition, that Arianism had already tended to obscure the real doctrine on our Lord's mediation;* which may, perhaps, account for St. Athanasius entering so fully into the subject: he certainly does so, and with such remarkable precision, as to claim a prominent place in the continuous chain of Catholic teaching on the subject. The passages occur in a comment upon Phil. ii. 9, 10, which the Arians had claimed as making for them; and having first overthrown

* "In the reason which this [Arian] confession alleges against [Sabellius's] doctrine, it is almost implied that the divine nature of the Son suffered on the cross. They would *naturally fall into this notion* directly they gave up their belief in our Lord's absolute divinity. It would as naturally follow to hold that our Lord had *no human soul*, but that His pre-existent nature stood in the place of it: also that His mediatorship was *no peculiarity of His Incarnation*."—(p. 115, note *f*.) "The Arians, even Eusebius, seem to have made His mediatorship consist essentially in His divine nature; . . . Eusebius considers Him as made in the beginning the 'Eternal Priest of the Father,' 'an *intermediate divine power*,' 'mediating and joining generated substance to the ingenerate.'"—p. 107, note *e*.

their pretensions, he proceeds to give his own interpretation of the text.

"If even before the world was made, the Son had that glory . . . it follows that He had no promotion from His descent, but rather Himself *promoted the things which needed promotion;* . . . He Himself has made us sons of the Father, and *made men gods* by becoming Himself man . . . *He was God and then became man, and that to make us gods.*"—pp. 235, 236.

"Since, then, the Word, being the image of the Father and immortal, took the form of a servant, and as man underwent for us death in His flesh, that thereby He might offer Himself for us through death to the Father, therefore, also, *as man* He is said, *because of us and for us*, to be highly exalted; that as by His death we all died in Christ, so again in the Christ Himself *we might be highly exalted*, being raised from the dead and ascending into heaven. . . . And as He Himself, who sanctifies all, says also that He sanctifies Himself to the Father for our sakes,* not that the Word may become holy, but that He Himself may *in Himself sanctify all of us*, in like manner we must take the present phrase, 'He highly exalted Him,' not that He Himself should be exalted, for He is the Highest, but that *He may become Righteousness for us.*' . . . If the Son *be* Righteousness, then He is not exalted, as being Himself in need, but it is we who are *exalted in that Righteousness*, which is He."—p. 238, 9.

"It is the Father's glory that man, *made and then lost*, should be found again; and when the prey of death, that He should be *made alive and become God's Temple.* For whereas the powers in heaven, both angels and archangels, were ever worshipping the Lord, as they are now worshipping Him in the name of Jesus, this is our grace and high exaltation, that even when He became man, the Son of God is worshipped, and the heavenly powers are not startled at seeing all of us, *who are of one body with Him, introduced into their realms. And this had not been unless* He who existed in the form of God had taken on Him a servant's form, and had humbled Himself, permitting His body to reach unto death."—p. 240.

"Because of our relationship to *His body*, we too have become God's Temple, and in consequence are made God's sons, so that even *in us the Lord is worshipped*, and beholders report, as the Apostle says, that God is in them of a truth."—p. 241.

In these beautiful passages St. Athanasius expresses the doctrine held by the Church from the first on the nature of our Lord's mediation; a doctrine which it is amazing that Protestants should so wholly overlook in the New Testament. To attempt a brief and most imperfect account of it, it was ever held that our Lord was "Mediator between God and man," because by His incarnation He extended, as it were, a bridge over the wide gulf which divided God and fallen human nature; and as on His Ascension he carried human nature in His person into the very heart (if we may so speak) of the blessed

* John, xvii. 19.

Trinity, so He has placed us the rest, except so far as our own sins have interposed a barrier, in so close and unspeakable a relation with Himself, that, as the Fathers were in the habit of saying, He has *deified* us; He has raised us above angels and archangels and the heavenly host, (to look only at His gifts, not our most deplorable and miserable backslidings and short-comings); He has bestowed upon us the very highest exaltation short of absolute divinity.* "*Partakers* of the divine nature," St. Peter tells us that we are; and St. Paul, that God "*hath* quickened us together with Christ, and *hath* raised us up together, and *hath* made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."† His *past* mediatorship, then, existed partly in that through the means of His incarnation and life on earth, and by the especial merits of His death and passion, He has *provided* this great gift for us *once for all:* His *present*, in that through the Spirit He dispenses it to us one by one; that, in proportion to our zeal in obedience and all good works, and with no other limit than our own sins impose, He "mediates between God and" us, becomes the channel of union and transformation of man into God, by imparting *Himself* to us really, substantially, and most intimately; and that He presents us, moreover, to His Father clothed in His righteousness, and regarded, not as we are in ourselves, but as integral parts of His mystical body. "The thought of His merits, when present with the Christian, enables him, in spite of his sins, to lift up his heart to God; and believing, as he does, that he is *in Christ*, or, in other words, that he addresses Almighty God, *not face to face*, but *in and through Christ*, he can bear to submit and open his heart to God, and wish it open."

Such is part of the doctrine included in those few words, which end our addresses to Almighty God, and which so many of us, it is to be feared, use with but slight perception of their real depth, "through Jesus Christ our Lord." And if men would embrace and realize this simple and scriptural view of our Lord's

* In another place St. Athanasius says *we* are made sons *verily*, *υἱοποιούμεθα ἀληθῶς*.—(p. 56.) The editor observes that St. Basil says we are sons *κυρίως*, "properly," and *πρώτως*, "primarily;" St. Cyril adds the word *φυσικῶς*, "naturally." He presently continues, "The doctrine, then, is, that, whereas there is a primary and secondary sense in which the word Son is used; primary when it has its formal meaning of continuation of nature, and secondary when it is used nominally, or for an external resemblance to the first meaning, it is applied to the regenerate, *not* in the secondary sense, but *in the primary*." "The actual presence of the Holy Spirit in the regenerate *in substance* constitutes this relationship of nature. . . . Nyssen implies the intimate association of our sonship with Christ's when he connects together *regeneration* with our Lord's *eternal generation*, neither being 'of the will of the flesh.'" No one who has not fully mastered this great doctrine is entitled to any opinion on a subject, which many, however, treat in an off-hand manner which is perfectly startling, the question, namely, what is the full and legitimate development of Catholic doctrine on the exaltation and intercessory power of the blessed Virgin.

† 2 Pet. i. 4; Eph. ii. 6.

mediation, (a truth which never could have been so neglected as it has been of late among us, *had we not neglected also the doctrine of His real presence* in Holy Communion,) they would at once perceive it to be, from its very nature, wholly peculiar and dissimilar in kind to the mere mediation of intercessory prayer; they would perceive that the very thought of the Saints in such a connection is, in the mind of the well-instructed Catholic, necessarily bound up with the thought of Him, who has united them and us together in so intimate a fellowship by knitting us into His own Body; and that the fear is as wholly chimerical and visionary of trust in the intercession of Saints lessening the intensity of our trust in the mediation of God Incarnate, as the fear would be of a similar effect resulting, from trust in the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, or in the providence of God the Father. But unthinking men will not bear in mind, that the ancient Catholic system is not a congeries of detached parts, but one consistent and majestic whole; they join together *their own* doctrine of the intercession of Christ with the *Catholic* doctrine of the intercession of Saints, and then complain that the two do not happily consort together. The real wonder would of course be if they *did*.

Let the study of Church history, then, be revived amongst us, in that open-minded and enlarged spirit, that freedom from attachment to the mere letter and formal detail of past institutions, which would certainly be effected by the assignment of their legitimate and absolutely exclusive pre-eminence to *doctrinal* considerations; let this be done, and we confess we look forward with highly-raised expectations to the probable result of such a procedure, in regard to our present "unhappy divisions." It is sad to think how many Christians at the present time (and we are far indeed from confining the remark to members of the English Church) are really at one upon all the points which can be called fundamental, and yet are prevented from realizing and building upon that unity, by their wide differences on subjects, which may certainly be considered as of an inferior and subordinate character. Numbers there are, *e.g.* among ourselves, who fully agree in the profession of attachment to the early Church, and a real wish to conform to its standard; in the desire to lay far greater stress than heretofore on prayer, obedience and self-denial as primary duties; in zeal for the Sacraments and other Church ordinances; and a deep sense of the unspeakable blessings which God gives us through their channel. And how painful a reflection to any one, who has imbibed so much of the Catholic spirit, as to burn for union with all those who so much as bear the *name* of Christ, (so far as truth and faithfulness will allow,) how painful to him the reflection, that all this agreement is felt

as yet to give no sufficient scope for genuine, hearty, unsuspicious sympathy, from the vivid perception we have of mutual differences, on points which, if less fundamental, are unhappily felt as even more obtrusive and (in a sense) practical!

That such differences there are (whatever undue prominence we are tempted on both sides to give them), is undeniable; and these differences, as they are certainly far more than merely formal or external, and correspond to a real difference of ethical character, so are doctrinally perhaps reducible to this question; viz. how far does the mediæval Church demand our unqualified sympathy? How far may it be considered as the very same in its claims upon us with the earlier Church, as being the external exhibition of the very same spirit, changed only in that it is in a farther stage of growth, and that the external circumstances with which it has to cope are so widely different? And in speaking of the mediæval Church's exhibition, we are far of course from confining our view to the mere formal statements of doctrine made at that period; we extend it to the whole system, which virtually received the Church's sanction: though on the other hand we may equally claim to consider that system, apart from incidental, local, temporary, or popular corruptions; such as will infect the highest and the noblest doctrines, when the standard of holiness grows low, and the Church's independence of state influence diminishes, and which, at a later period certainly, became so offensive as fully to deserve the severe censures passed upon them, *e. g.* in our own Articles, or in the Council of Trent. Now in cases where the questions at issue are far more vital and inclusive than here, in cases where we must be allowed to characterize the *explicit* doctrine maintained as nothing less than anti-Christian, even in these we have always ourselves maintained that, by means of mutual consideration and respect, final agreement is far from hopeless. "All that we need," says Archdeacon Manning very beautifully, "is low thoughts of ourselves, love one to another, a penetrating sense of God's presence, and of the *awful guilt of a bickering and controversial temper;* and in such a preparation of heart, to wait God's time of healing us."* By training ourselves carefully in lowly thoughts of ourselves, and a loving regard to *all* that is good in *all* others, we may well hope that in time serious minds, on either side, will both learn the real extent of their agreement, and discover also which external *statement* of doctrine is the real correlative to a religious heart. But how much more sanguine may our expectations justly be in the instance before us! That on all the points at issue truth is really on one side, and in fit time and place is to be contended for, we would be the last to deny; only let us not forget how

* Charge of July, 1842, pp. 40, 41.

many and how important are the points of *agreement*. Let us feel it, one and all, as our present duty, while we remain fully aware of each other's sentiments on these disputed points, still to put them, as far as circumstances will allow, from our thoughts, and apply our minds to the grateful task of extending and deepening our perception of what we have in common. On the primary points of doctrine, we all agree in reference to the same standard; yet little do we seem to feel how precious is this heritage of Catholic truth, how constraining and intimate a bond of union it will supply, when cordially embraced, to all Catholic hearts throughout Christendom.

Let us aim then at setting ourselves free from unworthy prejudices; on the one side national pride, or pride of consistency, or the mere feelings of undefined and traditional aversion; on the other side from youthful and intemperate impatience; from laying undue and unhealthy stress on our present evils; from inadequate appreciation of our present goods; above all, from the indulgence of mere taste and imagination: let each party (if party it may be called, when rather all shades and varieties of opinion are indefinitely intermingled) endeavour cautiously to guard against its besetting sins, and, as far as may be, with no other affection than love of holiness, and no other intention than desire of truth, throw their minds, in proportion to their opportunity, heartily and anxiously on the history of the earlier ages of the Church. It may be that while our mind is fixed on high doctrines and primitive faith, and occupied with nothing less than our present divisions—it may be that "God will reveal even *this* unto us;" that many questions connected with later ages may present themselves in new, and (as we shall then understand) far clearer colours. How far the special prerogatives, attached from the very first to the Roman See,* would prepare us for the circumstance as healthy, and natural, and designed by God's Providence, that when the Church's dependence on the civil power, which succeeded to its state of depression and mutual isolation, should, in its turn, give way to the period of its independent action, that at such time St. Peter's chair should obtain an unprecedented and peculiar authority: or how far the honour (to modern notions most superstitious and extravagant) paid in early times to Martyrs, marks the existence of a principle, which, when the special ages of martyrdom have passed, would display itself in honours of a different kind, but to modern notions no whit *more* superstitious and extravagant, to Saints generally, and to the

* The editor gives some instances (p. 44, note (*f*)), in which from the very first "*it interfered in the general conduct of the Church;*" and the real meaning of the term "Cathedra Petri," so familiar in the mouths of the Fathers, is an important element of the consideration.

Mother of God: or how far the idea, universally prevalent in the early Church, on some unknown suffering to be undergone between death and final bliss, would have its legitimate issue in the doctrine, so far as it was common to east and west at the time of the Council of Florence, as to the intermediate state: or what light the primitive view of *celibacy* would throw on later periods: or what light is thrown on the general question of doctrinal *development*, by the whole history of the very doctrine discussed in this volume: these are questions which, on their very statement, are seen to depend, for their solution, on an intimate, impartial, and clear-sighted view of early Church history.

Nor is it surely too much to ask, that those who profess "high-church" principles, and who have not the opportunity or the inclination for such deep study of doctrine, shall abstain from severe condemnation of the mediæval system. That many doctrines and practices were then sanctioned, very alien to the system in which he was trained, and far from congenial to his own mind, of this such a person may be fully aware: and as this is quite sufficient to guide his own practice, so surely it is all which charity can altogether justify him in maintaining. So long as he acts carefully up to the principles he has been taught, and *in* so acting feels himself in no way attracted towards these ways, so long it would be a plain sin *in him* to resort to them. But what more can he possibly know about the matter? They are *over and above* his own experience, *not contrary* to it.* He may know indeed that the *outward form* of the Church was, in very many particulars, changed; but then this is not so much *acknowledged* as *maintained* by those with whom he is at issue; for they would say that, considering the radical change of the *world's* circumstances, it would tend to make us doubt the continued existence within the Church of her old spirit of wisdom and sagacity, had she *not* changed her outward form. And whereas the real question is, whether identity of *doctrine* and of *ethical character* were preserved, he by hypothesis has no deep acquaintance with these, as they were *at first*. *Bishop Bull, e. g.* has fully earned his right to his very unfavourable judgment of the views and habits then prevalent; and his censure must ever carry with it great weight. What we have to balance

* He *is* justified, *e. g.* in saying that any such honour to Saints as encroaches on the supreme and undivided allegiance due to God, is anti-Christian; but then he would have St. Bernard or St. Buonaventura as zealous as himself in asserting this great and essential truth. The question at issue is of course, *was* the mediæval honour to Saints such? And this, as we say in the text, is a matter wholly foreign to his own experience. Again, he may believe that in *him* such language as they are known to have used, would encroach upon God's honour. Well, no one wishes him to use it: but how does it therefore follow that it did so in *them?* What inconceivable boldness to decide peremptorily on such a question, where the objects of criticism are God's Saints! Is it not quite a conceivable hypothesis (to say the very least) that holy and

in the opposite scale being, that others of no less religious attainments, no less capacious minds, and no less intimate acquaintance with the early Church than himself, have come to a very different conclusion; and these, persons who being *within* a very similar system, were a good deal more likely to view it in its true practical colouring and proportion, than we who are external to it.*

Our remarks hitherto have been, we fear, very discursive: we have, however, only committed to paper some of the thoughts which have been suggested to our own mind by the volume before us; as, indeed, the occasional running accompaniment of quotations from it in our foot-notes may tend to show. To express an opinion on the merits of the present edition would be presumptuous, in those who came to such a quarter simply to learn. We may say, however, that the body of collateral matter brought together in the notes from various (chiefly patristical) sources, and the original statements of doctrine introduced there from time to time, in no small extent diminish the difficulty, to which we lately alluded, of learning doctrine by historical inquiry.†

mortified men, whose conversation was in Heaven, may have entertained feelings of devotion and love, *e. g.* towards the Blessed Virgin, which no human language can at all adequately express; and yet that their feeling to our Lord should be altogether different in kind, and indefinitely stronger in degree? Yet what *words* could they *find* stronger than those already applied to the Blessed Virgin? What *words* can be stronger than the strongest?

* It is sometimes urged, and in quarters justly claiming our deep honour and respect, that those who feel the real unity in essentials existing among "high churchmen" in England, do ill in troubling such unity by making various statements about other Churches, which cannot but give offence. But we answer that it is not only among English "High Churchmen," but foreign Catholics also, that we recognize such essential unity. And on what single principle of Scripture or tradition can the position be maintained, to meet the objectors on their own ground, that unity of *a* national *Church* is a legitimate object of ultimate endeavour? Both Scripture and antiquity are clamorous and earnest indeed in favour of unity of *the* Church; but is the English establishment *the* Church? and of all points of agreement, for men to fix upon this as desirable, that no expression shall ever be used by members of the English Church, towards the decided majority of Catholic Christendom, (for such no English "High-Churchman" can deny the Roman Church to be), *except* expressions of enmity and alienation! Here is indeed a principle of "Church union!" What would St. Augustine have thought of it? If there *is* to be an armistice, let it be *on both sides*; if various highly respected persons will agree never to *censure* Rome, it is plain that they will at least be doing their part in removing one reason which exists for pointed and prominent descants in her praise. And now to take the question on another ground; if our present low state of morals and religion be closely connected with the State's tyranny over the Church, and if that tyranny (not to mention our doctrinal corruptions), is mainly encouraged by our isolation from the rest of Christendom, it is not a small responsibility which any one incurs, who uses harsh language at all against foreign churches: if *he is sure of his ground*, it may of course be his duty to do so; but he must not forget, that if it be not a plain *duty*, it is a very plain and very grievous *sin*.

† It would be travelling out of the line in which our remarks have hitherto run, to speak of these notes as illustrative of the *history* of the times. This is certainly a most important and necessary feature; for to have distinctly the least notion of all that is going on there, we have to transport ourselves in imagination into a state of society and an atmosphere of feeling as wide and complete a contrast to our own (by no means

Indeed, taking it all together, as most certainly a reader unversed in the subject will find himself, by the perusal of this book, carried as it were into a new and higher region of thought—so he can hardly, we imagine, rise from the attentive study of it, without finding himself in possession of a deep and accurate knowledge at least of the main points of the controversy there discussed. As to St. Athanasius himself, we are unwilling to trust ourselves with the expression of all that we think, lest it appear extravagant and hyperbolical, and cause a re-action of feeling; well knowing, as we do, that "one man's meat is another's poison," and that those very sentiments which transport this man almost out of himself with admiration and delight, only startle and confound his neighbour, as interfering with pre-conceived opinions. We will only say, then, judging from our own example, that there must be some, who, when they have in some small measure mastered the statements of doctrine and the arguments which this illustrious writer has put out in these treatises, may think themselves fortunate if they are not haunted by them in their dreams.

The most prominent feeling of alarm and distress, which will be excited in those who are not prepared to receive his teaching, will arise probably from the hardy venturousness with which he presses the statements of his adversaries to their legitimate conclusion, appearing the while wholly without fear of any possible danger to his own cause, from the retort of similar weapons. The simple reason for this is, of course, that he feels his position to be a *real* one—nay, the only real one, short of open and avowed rejection of Gospel truth; and until modern readers come to see and acknowledge this, their feelings of alarm and surprise must continue. The truth is, that we have been so long accustomed to a vague, shadowy, indefinite creed—to a creed which we dare not contemplate steadily, lest it fade from our sight *in* the contemplation—which we dare not approach closely, lest

indeed meaning either that they are all good and our's all bad, or the reverse), as can well be fancied. If any one has preserved up to this period a floating idea, that personal study of the Fathers is capable of becoming an available rule of faith to the private Christian, by which he can test the formularies of his own Church, or criticise those of other Churches, this volume and these notes must, we imagine, undeceive him. To think of an ordinary person having to examine for himself the question how far St. Athanasius's doctrine agrees with St. Hilary and St. Basil's, and how far it is the legitimate development of ante-Nicene statements (in many particulars so different); and on what principle the various Eastern councils were not ecumenical and authoritative between the Nicene and Constantinopolitan, but these were; and how far St. Athanasius's severe language towards the Arians was from the accident of his position and the habit of his time, or how far it claims our deference, &c. &c.! As to the duty of a private Christian in regard to his belief, during the present (as it may be called) temporary suspension of the prophetical office of the Church amongst us, we have taken the liberty of entering into it at some length in each of our last numbers. (British Critic for April, p. 286 to p. 295; for July, from p. 39 to p. 55.)

it melt away, as it were, from our very breath—that we cannot be brought into the presence of a real, orthodox Catholic, "knowing what he believes," and saying it, without feeling ourselves in a strange and uncomfortable position: we have been so long accustomed to theological gloom and twilight, that the first intrusion of the light of day pains and distresses us. The pain and distress, then, must, with such persons, come first; but the sun brings with it really light and warmth notwithstanding, and they, too, will in time learn to claim and appropriate their share in its happy influences; they, too, will in time exult that, after the long night, day has begun to dawn on them; that they have been rescued from the oppressive, arrogant, and insulting dominion of Protestant superstition, and brought out safely into the fulness and freedom of Gospel truth.

It is only, then, by study and gradual familiarity with such writings as those of St. Athanasius, that this distrust and suspicion can finally be removed; it may, however, tend in some degree to tranquillize the mind, and will also indeed make the whole subject clearer, if we draw attention to the analogy of natural religion. The circumstance is often commented upon, that all the epithets which we apply to God are of a *negative* character—*not* finite, *not* having a beginning, &c.; and it is inferred, that our conceptions of Him must ever be in the very highest degree vague and uncertain, insomuch that our true wisdom will ever be to aim rather at avoiding false ideas as to His attributes, than obtaining true. Now, if by this be merely meant, that we cannot contemplate God as if from without, that we cannot place before our imaginations a formed and definite idea of Him, the remark is of course true, and in the highest degree common-place. But if it be meant, that our knowledge of Him is not most real, positive, intimate, and distinguishable with entire certainty from all other ideas, we may appeal to the unbiassed judgment of any religious man, without fear for the result. Nor is this apparent contradiction (if we must, forsooth, so call it) peculiar to religion; the atheist cannot escape it. Mathematical truths, indeed—or, again, physical—may be in great measure viewed externally in their due shape and proportion; but let us only pass under our review all the most influential and constraining motives of daily life, and we shall see how different is the case with *them*. Duty to parents; reverence to elders; benevolence and beneficence to others; protection and preservation of self; these and a thousand others have each their respective claims upon us; and "a patient continuance in well-doing" imparts to us both a clearer view of the true adjustment of those claims, and deeper and more certain knowledge of those *principles* which give them authority. But who can profess to regard these principles as they are *in them-*

selves, in their length and breadth and real dimensions? Who can express them in *language* which will not represent them as if interfering with each other and mutually inconsistent? Nay, the very sense of duty itself, how absolutely and clamorously does it enforce its authority—yes, and impress its own peculiar idea,—upon the worst! how wholly unattainable any external view of that eternal law which it witnesses, even by the best! Well, then, may we be prepared to expect that, as of most other moral truths, so of God's nature and attributes, our knowledge shall be most certain and unmistakeable, and yet our intellectual perception vague and most imperfect.

And as a proof that the fact is so, let the supposition be fairly brought home to any religious person, of a denial, e. g. of God's existence from everlasting; will he not at once most deeply feel, that the idea of such denial is unspeakably painful and shocking to the imagination? and that, not as being an insult to some formula which he has learned to revere, but rather as threatening to take from him the possession of a real, living, vital truth, which he had rather die than part with. There *is* then such an idea—the *experimentum crucis* proves it—deeply implanted in the religious man's *moral* nature, and precious to him beyond words, as God's eternal pre-existence; and yet, as has been often enough remarked, if we attempt the intellectual apprehension of this truth—if we attempt to conceive, as an external fact, of God *having* lived ages *without end*, and *then* beginning to create—our mind recoils, baffled in its futile attempt. And a similar moral test may be applied to one after another of God's attributes, notwithstanding the absolute impossibility of any attempt to *reconcile* with each other, in our own minds, the expressions which are universally adopted to signify them.

And now, to advance a step further. The doctrine, that "in God we live and move and have our being," and that when He removes His presence and support, "we die and turn again to our earth"—this is also such, that its denial is felt by the religious man as an attack upon a first principle of his moral nature. The same feeling would be caused again, as all must equally admit, by the assertion that God is the Author of sin. "But how is this," it may be at once objected to him: "does not wickedness exist, and do not men work it? yet if God withdraws His presence, they die. He continues then His presence and support, at the very time when they are occupied in resisting His law. Is not this to be the Author of evil? Your very terms are self-contradictory." Now this objection, however, pressed home to him, gives him no real perplexity at all; he feels that there is no inconsistency of *ideas*, however embarrassed he may find him-

self in *expressing* any reply. Here, then, the theologian comes to his assistance; and drawing a distinction between *general* and *special* aid, anathematizes, with equal peremptoriness and decision, him who, in the case of wicked actions, shall *deny* to God the former, and him who shall *attribute* to Him the latter; as being persons who, each in their several ways, aim at depriving the humble and devout believer of truths, which are absolutely essential to his peace of mind and his religious progress.

On this the man of the world, who has been looking on, is ready with his pungent sarcasms, or his meditative and moralizing philosophy, according as his habit of mind may be. He is ready to deplore the fanaticism which contends for words and syllables, and to enlarge with much force and eloquence upon "the imperceptible hair's breadth" which is so insolently asserted to be the only orthodox way. In fact, for real shallowness and narrow-mindedness, there is no one to compare with your shrewd, sensible, calculating man of the world, and especially when religion is under discussion. In other matters the case is different. The accomplished painter speaks of some essential difference in colour, where to *us* all appears uniform; the experienced mariner sees the small cloud, sure precursor of a storm, where to others all appears bright and cloudless; and they are believed: it is acknowledged at once, that exercise and habituation give increased sharpness to the faculties, and that *they* are not to be criticised in their vocation by ordinary men. Yet how insignificant beyond words is *their* superiority in that respect over others, when compared with the difference, in perception of heavenly things, between him who "has not God in all his thoughts," who cannot bear to think of Him, and him, on the other hand, to whom that thought is his one stay, support, and happiness! And though this be so, yet will worldly men, for no other reason than because theological words and expressions give *them* no clearer idea than is afforded by the words "tree," "mountain," "ocean," to those born and bred in the midst of London, when they meet with the case of a serious person contending to the death for some real and vital doctrine, attribute the respective differences of judgment to his weakness, rather than to their own wickedness. The inference, in the meantime, to be drawn from the remarkable similarity to the case we have supposed, in the actual language used even by the better sort of Protestants towards Catholic doctrine, we leave it to themselves seriously to consider.

It appears then from what has been said, that the truths of natural religion address themselves to our moral, not our intellectual nature; and that, in the case of persons hitherto ignorant of them, though formal statements and definitions are in many cases

of the very greatest importance, as barriers to restrain the thoughts within the necessary limits, and to guide them in the necessary direction—still, like the palace of the fairy Pari-banou in the Arabian Nights, the home, towards which we desire to lead them, will by no means display itself to all who travel in the right direction, but only to the special favourites of its owner. That favour, indeed, in the case before us, is dispensed according to no other rule, than the moral fitness and preparation of the inquirer: but still it is quite to be expected, that those from whose eyes it is sealed, should exclaim against our elaborate and systematic erection of barriers, as being merely a "much ado about nothing;" and profess loudly, that *they* have travelled along the whole length of road marked out, and found it all barren and unprofitable. Yet surely the opposite dispensation would have been the one really mysterious; most mysterious and most shocking would it have appeared, had God, instead of so acting, *revealed* "these things to the wise and prudent," and *concealed* "them from babes."

The parallel we wish to draw between natural and revealed religion will, by this time, be manifest to all our readers;* yet, however obvious the truths we have stated, our present circumstances really require their enforcement. An orthodox Christian, *e. g.*, ignorant of the state of theology amongst us, would hardly believe his eyes on finding that a theological writer, with some name too for philosophy, has given expression to some such sentiment as this: "That it is idle to profess that accuracy of thought on sacred subjects which our technical language implies." Surely the most superficial dabbling in metaphysics would make the opposite hypothesis the more *probable*. "The inadequacy of the words of ordinary language for the purposes of philosophy," says Sir James Mackintosh, "is an ancient and frequent complaint, of which the justness will be felt by all, who consider the state to which some of the most important arts would be reduced, if the coarse tools of the common labourer were the only instruments to be employed in the most delicate operations of manual expertness." And on theological subjects especially, let any one observe the subtle, delicate, evanescent phenomena which hourly exhibit themselves in the religious mind, and compare them with the character of that instrument which is the only medium of their expression, and really (though we do not wish to use strong words) he will almost stand aghast at the reckless, thoughtless hardihood of the opinion which we just now quoted. Even in regard to natural religion, St. Augustine said, and all surely feel the truth of his saying, "Veriùs Deus cogitatur quàm dicitur; veriùs est quàm

* St. Athanasius appeals to the difficulties of natural religion by way of meeting the Arian sophistries.—p. 216.

cogitatur;" in which, conformably with the views we have been lately stating, we may be allowed to add another member to the climax: "Veriùs apprehenditur affectu quàm cogitatur intellectu." And if this be so in the religion which was coeval with the creation of the world, which has ever, in greater or less purity, influenced men's thoughts and expressions, how far more true will it be, when, at the end of 4000 years, it pleases God to reveal a new and extensive range of supernatural truths, which, that they may be revealed at all, must necessarily be translated into words and modes of thought, which originated with no reference to *them* whatever.

But it is necessary, as things are now, to recount a little more in detail what Christianity *does*, as a revelation, over and above the republishing with authority natural religion, (which, as Bishop Butler most justly says, is no insignificant consideration,) and apart from the gifts and graces which it bestows. It pleased God then in the "fulness of time," to give us additional knowledge of His own nature; and contemporaneously to begin a new course of Providential interference to last for ever, which He has also revealed to us, having its commencement in acts so marvellous and gracious, that it might well have been doubted by the holy Angels, whether men could bear to hear of them without losing their senses. The former revelation of course is the doctrine of the Trinity: the latter may be called comprehensively the Incarnation; including as it does Christ's Atonement, Resurrection, Ascension, mission of the Holy Spirit, and abiding Presence, in His Church, in His Saints, and in the Eucharistic elements. Now it is necessary to lay especial stress on the *first* of these plain facts; because men now-a-days have come to deny that the doctrine of the Trinity is, strictly speaking, any fresh revelation as to God's nature, and have challenged us to explain how it can be so. We answer, that our knowledge of the Blessed Trinity is absolutely and precisely the same, neither more nor less, with our knowledge of the existence and attributes of God. Christianity gives us increased knowledge; and as being on a subject of which our comprehension is but partial, increased knowledge brings with it, as its necessary shadow, increased mystery; but the *knowledge* is addressed primarily to our *moral* nature, the *mystery* offers itself incidentally to our *intellectual*. To object that those formal and technical terms, which guide indeed towards the revealed truth, and are its projection upon the intellect, but in no way profess to be more than distant approximations and faint shadows of its real impression upon the heart and conscience, to object that these so oppose and intersect each other, that their result on the whole is unmeaning, not to say self-contradictory,—is to make an objec-

tion which, as we have been urging, will tell with altogether equal force not only against natural religion, but against any system of *Atheistical* morality short of the lowest Utilitarianism—an Utilitarianism so low, that the basest of mankind, whatever his professions, *could* not bring himself to act in harmony with its dictates. Precisely the same may be said upon all the other mysteries of the Christian Revelation, and, inclusively, of that, the technical expression of which gives most offence and difficulty of all, the Real Presence.*

Are we asked for proof that there *is* a real assembly of truths, answering to the ecclesiastical expressions of Christian doctrine? We offer the very same which establishes the reality of our idea of God. The more conscientiously and strictly the orthodox believer walks, the more chastened and mortified his life, the more entirely by means of voluntary or involuntary suffering he is thrown on the thought of God for comfort, the more deep and stable has ever become his apprehension of the Christian doctrines, the more intimate and undoubting his conviction of their truth, the more warm and absorbing his love of them, the higher his sense of their inestimable value. Heretics, as they grow more spiritual, grow more dissatisfied and restless, and change from one heresy to another, till they find the truth; the orthodox feel with ever-increasing confidence that they *have* found it.† And the proof of the reality of *Christian* ideas might

* For whatever reason, our own Church imposes authoritatively no especial definition on this subject. The result of this procedure on her part, we may add, illustrates very forcibly by contrast the very great importance of strict definitions, after the rise of heresy on any doctrine; for sadly as the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation have been impaired among us, the extent of our loss in regard to *them* has not been comparable to our general defection on the subject of the Eucharistic Presence.

† "*All heresies seem connected together and to run into each other.* When the mind has embraced one, it is almost certain to run into others, apparently the most opposite, it is quite uncertain which. Thus Arians were a reaction from Sabellians, yet did not the less consider than they that God was but one Person, and that Christ was a creature. Apollinaris was betrayed into his heresy by opposing the Arians; yet his heresy started with the tenet in which the Arians ended—that Christ had no human soul. His disciples became, and even naturally, some of them Sabellians, and some Arians. Again, beginning to deny our Lord a soul, he came to deny Him a body, like the Manichees and Docetæ. The same passages from Athanasius will be found to refute both Eutychians and Nestorians, though diametrically opposed to each other; and these agreed together not only in considering nature and person identical, but, strange to say, in holding, and the Apollinarians too, that our Lord's manhood existed before its union with Him, which is the special heresy of Nestorius. Again, the Nestorians were closely connected with the Sabellians and Samosatenes, and the latter with the Photinians and *modern Socinians*. And the Nestorians were connected with *the Pelagians;* and Aerius, who denied episcopacy and *prayers for the dead*, with the Arians; and his opponent, the Semi-Arian Eustathius, with the Encratites. One reason, of course, of this peculiarity of heresy is, that when the mind is once unsettled it may fall into any error. Another is, that it *is* heresy; all heresies being secretly connected, as in temper, so in certain primary principles. And lastly, *the truth only is a real doctrine, and therefore stable;* every thing false is of a transitory nature and has no stay, like

be considered indefinitely stronger than that of merely *Theistical*, (did certainty admit of degrees, and did not the former *include* the latter,) by how much Christians attain more than others to the conscientious, mortified, and contemplative life.* And, again, that *each one* of the more prominent dogmatic definitions in use corresponds with a deep reality in the believer's mind; this also we prove by precisely the same test which we adopted in speaking of natural religion. Let the assertion in any way be brought home to the apprehension of the religious Catholic, that our Blessed Lord was before all creatures, but still a creature, and not co-eternal with the Father; or that He is not Very God as truly as the Father; or that there is no distinction in any sense between Him and the Father; or that His divine nature is not derived from the Father; or that there are more Gods than One; or, again, that He had not all the feelings and infirmities of human nature, sin only excepted; or that He had sin; or that the principle of any of His actions in the flesh was less than divine, (in other words, that He had a human personality); and so on with the rest: let this be done, and he will at once feel most acutely that a vital, an absolutely essential, part of the one support of his religious life is attacked; that if he is to enjoy happiness, if he is to advance in holiness, he must be sheltered and protected from the endurance of such blasphemies.† We are of course not saying that *among us at present* religious men will in general so feel; of course not; we have been all along saying the very reverse—that members of our Church have practically to so great an extent let slip vital truths. But so much as this is quite certain, that if the heretical statements above mentioned, and many others that might be named, do *not*, on being brought home to a man's *apprehension*,‡ awake a jarring chord in his breast, to

reflections on a stream, one opinion continually passing into another, and creations being but the first stages of dissolution."—p. 189, note *b*. "It was the tendency of *all* [these] heresies to explain away or deny *the Atonement*."—p. 267, note *l*.

* There is a further proof of course, not here alluded to, the ever-increasing depth of meaning which orthodoxy gives to *Scripture*.

† "Is it not enough to distract a man on mere hearing, though unable to reply, and to make him stop his ears, from astonishment at the novelty of what he hears them say, which even to mention is to blaspheme?"—p. 230.

‡ Both here and on a former occasion we have used this form of expression, being of course well aware that it is not by heretical *statements* that the unintellectual become aware of the presence of heresy, any more than by orthodox *statements* they learn orthodoxy. We must forbear all discussion of the question in what manner they *are* to be taught it if they have it not, (though it bear so closely on the course of our remarks,) not as being without things to say on the subject, but rather as feeling that so *much* must be said if any intelligible account is to be given. The whole subject indeed of the religious *knowledge* of a saint-like and heavenly-minded believer, who should be wholly without intellectual cultivation, is full of importance, interest, and (we may add) mystery, and well deserves a separate discussion by itself. In the mean time we will enunciate the following sentiment, which is very intimately con-

that extent, be it greater or less, he falls essentially short of Christian faith. And in proportion as serious minds are led from the habit of *self*-contemplation to the thought of *God*, they must press forward, as we have said more than once, into the full orthodox belief, or else give up all the most sacred truths they already hold; unless indeed they adopt the alternative of diverting their thoughts from all specially Christian doctrines whatever. The practically existing creed of the Protestant world, it cannot be too often repeated, is exactly what they falsely charge upon the Catholic—a mere assemblage of words and notions, without any moral substance to correspond. Still, most happily, wherever there is to be found humility, conscientiousness, and devotion, (and we fully trust they are not rarely to be met with among the popular religionists,) there is the quickening and informing spirit which will give life and reality to the abstract statements of the orthodox creed; and thus a retreat will be prepared, to which the awakened and alarmed conscience may betake itself, when it perceives its existing position crumbling from its own intrinsic rottenness, from its want of all consistency and coherency of parts.

We have been so far carried away by our ever-burning zeal against the present practical English system, that we must use as it were a sudden wrench to return to the regular thread of our argument. But we are unwilling to omit this further consideration, that if it be necessary to grant that in the ecclesiastical system of doctrine, there are some subtle theoretical statements, which answer to nothing existing in the minds of the most holy and mortified of men, unless he superadd a keen and practised intellect to his holiness (on which, whether it be so or not, we pronounce no judgment); *this* also has its exact parallel in natural theology. Deductions have been made from the first principles of *theism*, and are accounted by all thoughtful men as most certainly true, which appear at first sight as fully removed from the region of *moral* experience, as do the most extreme statements on the doctrine of the Trinity. We allude to such as the following; that the hypothesis of God imparting to a creature the power of creation, or, again, the power of simple prescience, (as distinguished from expectations founded on experience and sagacity,) would be, in fact, self-contradictory and absurd.

Lastly, let us meet Protestants on their own ground. If the Christian revelation, from being conversant with matters above our comprehension, in giving increased knowledge gives also

nected with the whole history of doctrinal controversies (without however attempting to state our reasons for it), that there can be no security of so much religious knowledge (whatever its amount) being offered to humble believers as their progress in holiness really requires, unless those who have cure of souls be one and all not orthodox only, but thoroughly versed in the recognized forms and ideas of doctrinal expression.

increased mystery, it is very natural and to be expected, that the Scripture intimations on the highest points of doctrine shall be on the surface self-contradictory, and in real truth very difficult to be reconciled and adjusted. And so the Catholic Church has ever felt; her system is not more remarkable for being the only one in which the contemplative mind can find rest, than for being the only one which fairly recognizes and preserves a place for *all* the classes of Scripture texts. The Protestant takes some one "leading idea," according to his own inclination, and violently compresses all passages of a different bearing into agreement (or rather, for this is all he claims, non-*dis*agreement) with this one idea. But, indeed, such texts as the following (and the number might be indefinitely multiplied) have neither force nor even meaning, except as connected with a range of doctrine which Protestants, with all their mutual differences, (and they are neither few nor inconsiderable,) *all* agree in putting aside as speculative, "metaphysical," (!) and unpractical: John, v. 19, 26, 30; x. 17, 18; xiv. 28; xvi. 13, 15; xvii. 3,* 5, 19,† 22;‡ Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. viii. 6;* xv. 24; Eph. i. 10; Heb. v. 8, 9.† Now the question is fairly asked them: they are energetic in their enunciation of the great "truth" that Scripture was given to teach all men; and here are a class of texts (not one or two obscure passages, but a whole class, indeed very many more might be added,) bearing upon a view of doctrine the contemplation of which, to say the least, they discourage. *Why were those passages written?* Is Scripture given only to perplex us?§ Protestants are very anxious that we shall not strive to be wise "above what is written:" we thank them for their advice, and hope to be on our guard; but let us observe that their cautions would carry with them far greater weight, could we observe in *them* any real anxiety to be wise *up* to what is written.

* See p. 33, note r.

† See p. 247. Observe also the following note (p. 250, note *d*): "What connection is there between the sanctification of Christ's manhood and ours? How does it prove that *human nature* is sanctified because a particular specimen of it was sanctified in Him? St. Chrysostom explains: 'He is born of our substance; you will say, this does not pertain to all; yea, to all: He mingles Himself with the faithful individually *through the mysteries;* and whom He has begotten, those He nurses from Himself, not puts them out to other hands.' 'It sufficed not for Him to be made man, to be scourged, to be sacrificed, but He assimilates us to Him; nor merely by faith, but really, has He made us His body.' 'That we are commingled into that flesh, not merely through love, but really, is brought about by means of that food which He has bestowed upon us,'" &c. This bears closely on what we said a few pages back, on the incommunicable peculiarity of His mediatorship, and its connection with the Real Presence.

‡ See p. 250.

§ "Scripture is full of mysteries, but they are mysteries of *fact*, not of words. Its dark sayings or ænigmata are such because in the nature of things they cannot be expressed clearly. What is commonly called explaining away Scripture, is this transference of the obscurity *from the subject to the words used.*"—p. 238, note *e*.

If any one desire then really to enter into the words and thoughts of St. Athanasius, he must take for granted on faith that it was a *real* view of doctrine for which he was contending, and must take pains to master it; otherwise they must ever remain to him a puzzle and perplexity. To Athanasius the truth assailed by Arius was as much a matter of simple perception, as were the objects around him which he felt and saw. True it is, indeed, that though this be ever the case with deeply religious men, still it does not preserve them from the danger of *misunderstanding* others. To enter into another's feelings, to see things from his point of view, is at all times one of the most difficult intellectual exercises; and in the present instance, there is superadded to the ordinary difficulty of the endeavour, the peculiar perplexity arising from the total inadequacy of language, as a means of communication on spiritual subjects. Accordingly, there has ever been in the Church, from the very first, a school of divines who, whether from deficiency in acuteness of intellect, or in activity of imagination, nay, in some cases perhaps, in full Christian charity, have had a tendency to make their brethren "offenders for a word," and to allow differences in detail or in expression to obscure their perception of real substantial agreement. Nor again would it be very unnatural in a reader, impregnated with the current notions of the day, to be tempted, from a superficial perusal of the present volume, to refer St. Athanasius to that class. Near the opening he speaks (p. 9) of the Arians' "*diabolical* irreligion," which the editor quietly assures us "is Athanasius's deliberate judgment" (note *s*); and "Ario-maniacs" is perhaps his commonest name for them.

However, so far is this from being a true view of St. Athanasius's character, that, as all students of Church history well know, he may be taken as the very type of the opposite principle. From the foundation of the Church to this very day, there probably has never been a divine who has so signally displayed the union of unflinching, unflagging zeal for the truth, with unwillingness to "think evil," and with that quickness of discernment which discovers identity of principle, however concealed amidst difference of language.* To enter into the whole case of the Arians would lead us into far too wide a field; but it may be well to put toge-

* See on this subject p. 17, note *m*. "One of the characteristic points in Athanasius is his constant attention to the *sense* of doctrine, or the *meaning* of writers in preference to the word used. Thus he scarcely uses the symbol ὁμοούσιον, one in substance, throughout his orations, and in the De Synod. acknowledges the Semi-Arians as brethren. Hence he says, infr. § 18, that orthodox doctrine 'is revered by all, though expressed in strange language, provided the speaker *mean* religiously, and wishes to convey a religious sense.' He says also that Catholics are able to 'speak freely,' or to expatiate, παῤῥησιαζόμεθα, 'out of Divine Scripture.'—(Orat. i. § 9, &c.) Again, 'Not the phrase, but the meaning and the religious life, is the recommendation of the faithful.'"—Ad. Ep. fig. § 9.

ther from the present volume a few intimations as to their real character. Let us first see as to their doctrine.

"He has stated in his Thalia that 'even to the Son the Father is invisible,' and 'the Word cannot perfectly and exactly either see or know His own Father;' but even what He knows and what He sees, He knows and sees '*in proportion to his own measure*,' as we also know in proportion to our own power. For the Son, too, he says, not only knows not the Father exactly, for He fails in comprehension, but 'He knows not even His own substance;' and that 'the substances of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost are separate in nature, and estranged, and disconnected, and alien, and without participation of each other,' and in his own words, '*utterly unlike from each other in substance and glory into infinity*.' Thus as to 'likeness of glory and substance,' he says that the Word is entirely diverse both from the Father and the Holy Ghost.....These are portions of Arius's fables as they occur in that jocose composition."—pp. 186, 187.

Or, if we would have it more pointedly,—"on being asked whether the Word of God is capable of altering, *as the devil altered*, they scrupled not to say, 'Yea, he is capable.'"—(p. 230, note *a*.) Do we wish to learn the nature of their personal religion? Arius, in order to popularize his creed, put the most profane and *unfeeling* argumentation in favour of it into the metre usually used for love songs, in order to circulate it extensively among the people. This was Arius's famous "Thalia;" and we may here insert one of the editor's notes.

"St. Athanasius speaks of 'the dissolute manners' and 'the effeminate tone' and 'the jests' of the Thalia; a poem which, he says shortly before, 'is not even found among the more respectable Greeks, but among those only who *sing songs over their wine*, with noise and revel.'... Socrates, too, says that 'the character of the book was gross and dissolute.' The Arian Philostorgius tells us that 'Arius wrote songs for the sea, and for the mill, and for the road, and then set them to suitable music.'... If one were to attempt to form a judgment on the nature of Arius's proceeding, it would be this, that he attempted to popularize his heresy by introducing it into the common employments and recreations of life; and having no reverence, he fell into the error of modern religionists, who, with a better creed, sing spiritual songs at table, and use in their chapels glees and opera airs. This would be more offensive of old even than now, in proportion to the keener sensibilities of the south, and the more definite ideas which music seems to have conveyed to their minds; and more especially in a case where the metre Arius employed... had obtained so *shocking a reputation*, and was *associated in the minds of Christians with the deeds of darkness*, in the midst of which, in those heathen times, the Church lived and witnessed."—p. 94, note *a*.

Again:

"[The] miserable procedure of making sacred and mysterious subjects a matter of popular talk and debate, which is a sure mark of heresy, had

received a great stimulus about this time by the rise of the Anomæans.... Socrates says that 'in the imperial court the officers of the bedchamber held disputes with the women, and in the city in every house there was a war of dialectics.'... St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of the heretics [at Constantinople] as 'aiming at one thing only, how to make good or to refute points of argument,' making 'every market-place resound with their words, and spoiling every entertainment with their trifling and offensive talk.'... [St. Gregory Nyssen says,] 'Men of yesterday and the day before, mere mechanics, off-hand dogmatists in theology, servants too, and slaves that have been flogged, runaways from servile work, are solemn with us and philosophical about things incomprehensible; with such the whole city is full; its smaller gates, forums, squares, thoroughfares; the clothes-venders, the money-lenders, the victuallers. Ask about pence, and he will discuss the Generate and Ingenerate; inquire the price of bread, he answers, Greater is the Father, and the Son is subject; say that a bath would suit you, and he defines that the Son is out of nothing.'"—p. 213, note *a*.

This merely intellectual, abstract argumentation from theological *words*, exclusive of any reference to their *moral* and *religious* bearing, has been sometimes by ignorant persons attributed to both sides in the controversy; but, in fact, it has ever been a peculiar note of heresy. Contrast with such proceedings as we have just noticed, St. Athanasius's tone in controversy; for instance, in the following passage.

"They had best been silent; but since it is otherwise, it remains to meet their shameless question with a bold retort..... *After many prayers then* that God would be gracious unto us, we might ask them in turn, &c. Indecent is such an inquiry,—yea, indecent and very blasphemous, yet parallel with theirs."

And the Editor quotes in the notes, among other similar passages from his writings, these:

"The unwearied habit of the religious man is to worship the All in silence, and to hymn God his Benefactor with thankful cries; but since," &c. "I must ask another question, bolder, yet with a religious intention; be propitious, O Lord," &c.—p. 216.

It may be allowed, perhaps, to add two irrefragable testimonies on the character of the Arians. The one shall be from Milner's Church History, written, as is notorious, by a divine far indeed from being prejudiced in favour of the orthodox as such, but who, it is only fair to add, writes in so very religious a spirit, and with so anxious a desire of doing justice to all sides, as to throw a peculiar charm about the book, notwithstanding its great, its almost innumerable, faults as a history. He tells us plainly (vol. i. p. 536), that "the Arians seem evidently to have been given up to the greatest villanies and profligacy;" and (p. 612),

that "every thing mean and sordid, cruel and inhuman, ambitious and perfidious, is found on the side of Arianism." Our other authority is Mr. Milman, who admits (vol. iii. p. 11), that "the Arian party, *independent of their speculative opinions*, cannot be absolved from the unchristian heresy of cruelty and revenge;" and his own account of the scenes which took place impresses a vivid perception that he has in this expression greatly understated the bitter, unrelenting, and savage cruelties which they inflicted. His form of speech implies, as his own judgment, that if persons will but abstain from injuring and persecuting one another, it is comparatively a very light matter that they blaspheme their great Benefactor, and (as far as their words can do it) degrade their Creator to the rank of a creature. But the very badness of his principles makes his testimony to *facts* the more important.*

Without going any further then, it would appear that on emerging from the heathen persecutions, the Church was very soon subjected to trials of a different sort. That she should be assailed from without might be expected; it was her appointed portion: but Satan's new device was, that there should be neither rest nor comfort for her children *within*; that humble and child-like believers shall have no security against violence being done to their keenest sensibilities, against insults being offered to their most sacred and most deeply-loved objects of veneration, by those who should call themselves brethren. Such were the phenomena of the detestable Arian heresy; the like to which, in unredeemed wickedness, it might perhaps be difficult to find in the history of the world. At a time when faith glowed with a fervour of which we can now form no conception, the terms which it had associated with its most cherished objects were treated as mere counters for intellectual sport, as mere occasions for unfeeling and flippant sophistry, as mere vehicles for the display of logical and rhetorical ingenuity;—at a time when a gravity and awe pervaded the general mind upon religious subjects, which, to the taste of the present day, would appear superstitious and imbecile, the most sacred terms and symbols of their religion were bandied about by the lowest of mankind, were adapted to a metre, and to a strain of music, hitherto reserved for the lightest, or rather the vilest and most flagitious, topics;—at a time when joint suffering might have been supposed to draw peculiarly close the bonds of Christian fellowship, cruelties, rivalling the heathen inflictions in intensity and duration, were perpetrated upon their brethren by men calling

* It is fair to add, that he appears to suspect the orthodox also of cruelty; but it must also be felt by a tolerably candid reader, that in this view his facts are very far from bearing him out. It should be said in fairness, that this writer also displays a great wish to be equitable in his judgments, though of course, with his doctrinal views, their value, on many subjects which he handles, can be absolutely nothing.

themselves Christians. And what was the great object for which these extremities were adopted? It was in order that Him, Who being God, had taken flesh and died on the cross for their redemption, His redeemed creatures might gradually cease to worship *as* God altogether.

Will it be said that it is unfair to class all who were united against St. Athanasius in the same category? None can have been more fully sensible of this than the Saint himself. In every movement of the sort, there will always be numbers of men, in the main orthodox, but who, being neither habituated to very devotional habits and practices, nor endued with an especially quick and penetrating intellect, are far from sensitive as to the taint of heretical pravity. Such men usually exclaim against those who are more clear-sighted, and who call upon them to nip the mischief in its bud, as being fanciful and over-scrupulous; though, when it is grown to a head, and is beyond their power of resistance, they are as truly sensible of its evil as were its first assailants. There can be no doubt that great numbers of the bishops, who were carried over the country away from their sees, (often not a little against their will,) by order of the Emperor, to attend council after council, were mainly of this character, and were quite ready to become the unconscious instruments in the hands of the crafty and active leaders of the party; and the histories of the time show how fully St. Athanasius, in the measures which at a later period he counselled in their regard, recognised this state of the case.* Again, the notes of this volume speak also of the Eusebians, or court-party, with whom the favour of the Emperor was ever the principal object. Of these the saint speaks with severity indeed, as was becoming, but so as plainly to mark them off from the simply profane and fanatical heretics.† Lastly, there are the Semi-Arians, who scrupled at the word ὁμοούσιον, but, latterly at least, could hardly be said to differ in doctrine from St. Athanasius himself. It appears, from the notes of the second treatise in this volume, that these had gradually been rising in orthodoxy for some years past, as was to be expected in religious and conscientious men; until at length they came to an open rupture with their party, when the heretical element developed itself into the open blasphemies of Eunomius and Aetius. His mode of alluding to these will be a forcible illustration of the comprehensiveness of his charity.

"Those who deny the Council altogether are sufficiently exposed by these brief remarks; those, however, who accept every thing else that was defined at Nicæa, and quarrel only about the 'One in Substance,'

* See, *e.g.* Newman's Arians, p. 382-3.

† See p. 127-8, and note *g*.

must not be received as enemies; nor do we here attack them as Ariomaniacs, nor as opponents of the Fathers, but we discuss the matter with them as brothers with brothers, *who mean what we mean*, and dispute only about the word. For, confessing that the Son is from the substance of the Father, and not from other subsistence; and that He is not creature nor work, but *His genuine and natural offspring;* and that He is eternally with the Father, as being His Word and Wisdom; they are not far from accepting even the phrase 'One in Substance.'"—p. 138.

And a similar distinction, which he seems always to have kept carefully before his mind, between the *word* ὁμοούσιον, (the duty of holding which was merely a point of discipline,) and the doctrine itself, (which was of course an essential article of faith,) will be found towards the very beginning of the volume. "Let them defend themselves," he says (p. 5) "against the proofs of *heresy* which have been advanced, and then will be the time to find fault, if they can, with the definition framed against them." That is, if they were sound in *doctrine*, we might amicably discuss with them the advisableness of the particular definition adopted; but it is hardly to be expected that criminals *shall* be struck with admiration, at the appositeness and beauty of language, with which the judge pronounces their doom.

There are several other particulars to which we could have wished to allude, but our limits warn us to conclude. In doing so, it may be as well to mention, for the convenience of the reader, that the first of the treatises in this volume, called the "De Decretis," was written after the Saint's first banishment, and while in full possession of his see; the second and third ("De Synodis," and "Orations") were written by him in succession, and circulated by him from church to church, during the persecution of Constantius; while he was in close concealment among the monks of the desert, and a price set upon his head.

ART. IV.—1. *The Standard and Record Newspapers, on the Contest for the Poetry-Professorship.*

2. *The Standard and Record, on the Hampden Question.*

WERE we writing a pamphlet instead of contributing to a review, we should certainly be inclined to head our remarks with some such title as one of the following—Promises and their Fulfilment, or the Poetry-Professorship and Hampden Contests compared—or Acts and Professions, the Poetry-Professorship and Hampden Contests compared—or Modern Orthodoxy—or the New Guardians of the English Church—or A new Method of Defending the Faith; appending to each the same explanatory tale—*or* the Poetry-Professorship and Hampden Contests compared. We will interpret our meaning more at length.

It will be within the recollection, the fresh recollection, we are sure, of all our readers, for it is little more than half a year since; that the appearance of Mr. Williams as candidate for the poetry-professorship excited an alarmist cry of the most extraordinary loudness and vehemence among the members of what is designated the Evangelical party. Two journals, one their legitimate and authoritative, the other, on that as on other occasions, their self-constituted, but no less recognized, mouthpiece; aided by others more or less under the same influence, occupied themselves for the space of four months in appeals to the country and the University on the danger with which the established religion was threatened. Column after column appeared filled with letters from True Protestants, True Englishmen, True Members of our beloved Church, True Admirers of our excellent Liturgy, True Maintainers of our Articles and Formularies, from Orthodox M.A. and Fidelis B.D., and Oxonienses, Members of Convocation, and Champions of the Faith under every variety of name and title. The line taken by these writers was clear, decided, and uniform throughout. On the one hand they assailed their opponent's school as disaffected to their Church; impugners of her articles, innovators on her forms, underminers of her creed, and pledged, in short, to the change and overthrow of her whole system. On the other hand they described themselves as her sincere and faithful sons, the staunch supporters of those formularies which were in danger, and watchful guardians of that creed which was being undermined. They gave themselves out, in a word, as the champions of orthodoxy, and the watchwords were—sound doctrine—our ancient faith—the Church as she is—our old established system—no treachery, no innovation; our part is taken, we are sons of

the Church of England, and will fight for all she holds and teaches to the last.

These effusions of orthodoxy, coincident, as they happened to be, with the progress of a rival school, were regarded with considerable suspicion, by those especially who remembered the various extensive schemes of Church Reform that issued from the same party some ten years ago, when that was the fashionable topic; to say nothing of the well-known objections held all along to certain portions of our services, which involved the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration—a somewhat vital point on which to be at acknowledged variance with the Church we belong to. However all the world is not so ill-natured as to remember what happened ten years ago; and in the meantime it is not necessary to be putting forward always any doctrinal scruples that may be entertained. The rise of the "new school" too had drawn public suspicion another way, and made another and very different class of doctrines the object of alarm. So on the whole the new orthodox manifesto went off successfully, and the watch-word of sound doctrine produced an impression, and carried weight and consequence with it. How long indeed such a position could be maintained was another question, because professions, after being made, come sometimes in the natural order of events, and the movements of the world around us, to be *tested.* But in the meantime the mind is tenderly alive to the consolatory thought that that day may be indefinitely distant; nor is there any use in being "over exquisite to cast the fashion of uncertain evils." In this great commercial country we are not ignorant of the importance and convenience of the system of *credit;* and if we have an easy party to reckon with, who does not make rigorous inquiries into the reality of our resources, and the soundness of our bottom and capital, we may count upon an easy and secure enjoyment of our position for some time to come; and we are only immediately concerned with the fact that we are at present very comfortable and well-off.—Unfortunately however for the parties we are alluding to, the day of reckoning came considerably quicker than could have been anticipated.

It so happened that within four months after this exhibition of sentiment had taken place, came the sudden and unlooked for revival of the Hampden Question. What part, after such a public profession, could be expected from this party on such an occasion, it is surely an insult to reason to doubt.

Dr. Hampden had in 1836 been formally condemned by the University for open and explicit Rationalism and Latitudinarianism. He had been condemned as one whose "*publications abounded with contradictions to the doctrinal truths which he was*

pledged to maintain, and with assertions of principles which necessarily tended to subvert not only the authority of the Church, but the whole fabric and reality of Christian truth." "We cannot allow," it was added, "any explanations of insulated passages or particular words to be valid in excuse against the positive language, the systematic reasonings, and the depreciating tone with which, in Dr. Hampden's works, *the Articles of our Church are described as mere human speculations, the relics of a false and exploded philosophy, full at once of error and mischief.*"* Such was the ground of the original censure, nor had that ground shifted one iota; Dr. Hampden was the same in 1842 that he was in 1836: truth was the same; and therefore we presume the judgment of the University ought to be the same. Nevertheless what is the course taken by the professed guardians of the orthodoxy of our Church—they flock up in numbers to Oxford to vote for the removal of the stigma which had been so solemnly, so unanimously fixed upon the propounder of heterodoxy—they, the supporters of our Church's creed, give a combined vote for clearing from censure one who, by putting all creeds upon a level, abolished them all, and destroyed the authoritative distinction between truth and error in religion.

Nobody can reasonably deny that here is at any rate a *primâ facie* case of contradiction and inconsistency, which may or may not admit of excuse when it comes to be examined, but which, *until* a proper explanation be given, remains so much simple contradiction. What excuse do they offer? Dr. Hampden had made no recantation, nothing that could possibly be construed into one. This constituted a clear case against him of itself. But more than this, not only had he done this negatively, i. e. simply *not* recanted, but he had *positively declared* that he would retract nothing. As a kind of climax to the *silent* interval of non-retractation which he had passed since his appointment, and as if for the express purpose of making certainty doubly sure, he summoned the University to the divinity school, only a week before the day of voting, in order to tell them that though, if he had ever said anything that was wrong, he should be happy to confess it, "*he was not aware that he had.*" If the case was clear before, now it was clearer still; they had Dr. Hampden's own words identifying his present opinions with those for which he was condemned.

Nay—for the case may be driven nearer home still—we have the admission of this very party itself on the subject of this non-retractation. They admit that "*the reasons of this deficiency are more apparent than capable of complete justification,*" and that

* Oxford Declaration, March 10, 1836.

they "had perceived all along that *it was difficult ground which the Hebdomadal Board assumed on this occasion.*"* But surely the remark is natural—if they perceived so clearly all along that it was *difficult ground* which the Hebdomadal Board assumed, why did they adopt and act upon it? They perceive, it seems, the difficulty of the Hebdomadal Board, but they do not at all perceive that if they adopt the same *ground*, they are in the same difficulty themselves.

Against the plain state of the case then—that Dr. Hampden did not retract—that Dr. Hampden *said* he did not retract—that *they* said Dr. Hampden *ought* to retract—what have they to set off as a counterbalance? We lack some very powerful ground, if that be possible, when the other side has swallowed up all. What is it? They "*felt* Dr. Hampden was theologically not the same man in 1842 that he was in 1836." They *felt* indeed; but if Dr. Hampden ought to have retracted and did not, what right had they to *feel* this. Dr. Hampden, and he surely ought to know best, *felt* quite otherwise—he *felt* "that he had never said anything wrong"—he *felt* and he declared most positively that he was the *same man* "in 1842 that he was in 1836." The journalist overrules Dr. Hampden's assertion that he held the same views he always had, and interrupts him with—No, Sir, you do not hold the same views. "During the interval your perceptions of divine truth have been rectified, and become scriptural, and in your lectures and your writings you have rendered essential service to the cause of truth."†

Such is the nature of the "difficulty" in which these supporters of Dr. Hampden find themselves; they want a retractation, but unfortunately the only one they can get is one of their own, *for* the Regius Professor; for none, of any sort or kind, can they extract from him. When persons voluntarily, and with their eyes open, put themselves upon "difficult ground" like this, they certainly cannot lay claim to much consideration or tenderness from their opponents. For to carry on the matter one step more —what particular reason was there for encountering all this "difficulty," what absolute necessity lay upon them for subjecting themselves to so clear a charge of inconsistency and self-contradiction? Did Dr. Hampden's opponents call upon them to pass a new vote against him? Were they wanted to aid in any *fresh* advance of orthodoxy in the University, or to contribute to any *change* whatever in the state of things? Not at all—all that was wanted to be done was to *let things alone*, to suffer things *to stay as they were*, to prevent *alteration*, to allow the University

* Record, June 9. † Ibid.

to keep its old, established, and recognized ground. They were begged and prayed simply and solely *not to disturb things*, but they would not enter even into such a quiet and moderate view. They preferred assisting in a *movement*, an *innovation*, a *new effort of religious liberalism*. The censure was lying upon Dr. Hampden, they would not let it lie on, but voted for removing it.

Thus gratuitously did they run to meet the "difficulty" in which they have placed themselves. *Admitting* that Dr. Hampden ought to retract his opinions, *knowing* that he had not, and knowing that he had declared he *could not, because he still held them*, they yet went *out of their way*, positively out of their way, to disturb the formal judgment of the University upon him—because, as they explain, they *felt* that he was not the same theologian that he was. Of all the extraordinary arguments that we ever remember any persons or parties offering for themselves, this is certainly the most extraordinary. There is a kind of explanation, which, everybody knows, leaves a difficulty greater than it was before; and this seems to be of that kind. The evangelical supporters of Dr. Hampden had certainly better have left their ground or rationale, whatever it was, upon the ocean of conjecture; they had better have left such various and conflicting phenomena to some bolder powers of hypothesis, than we pretend to, to solve. Philosophers entertain hopes of reducing even the shiftings of wind and weather into system and law; and perhaps some favourable mode of accounting for the late fluctuations in the religious world might have been discovered, had not the parties themselves furnished one which fixes the confusion that it ought to clear, and prevents all farther liberty of conjecture.

And these are the parties whose orthodoxy was so conspicuous nine months ago; who, in opposition to Mr. Williams' supporters, were such zealous Church of England men, such sticklers for our Liturgy and Articles. Is this their mode of defending the Creed and the Articles of the Church, to give immunity to a system which describes them both as "mere human speculations, the relics of a false and exploded philosophy?" Do they suppose they defend the Church by withdrawing one iota of censure from "principles which necessarily tend to subvert not only the authority of the Church, but the whole fabric and reality of Christian truth?" If they do, may the Church evermore be defended from such defenders.

But what we have given is only one side of the labyrinthal justification put forth—being *that side* of it which supposes Dr. Hampden to have been in error originally—"Dr. Hampden has never confessed his previous error"—the *other* shifts the ground,

and defends him *from the first.* "There was something," we are told, "in this unjust and incongruous state of things (alluding to the position of the Tractarians) abhorrent to just feeling, and fitted to stimulate the desire not only to raise Dr. Hampden to his just position in the University, but to *wipe off the slur which others far less estimable than he had been the chief instruments of casting on his reputation.*"* The censure of 1836 to be called *a slur on his reputation!* Why, if he was in error at the time, as has been admitted, he of course deserved the "slur," or rather there was no "slur" at all. And this "slur" to be attributed to the Tractarians, who are thus condemned for having lifted up their voice against *acknowledged "error!"*—the opposition to "*error*" to be voluntarily handed over to them as a reproach! Strange ground for persons to take as a theme of self-congratulation:—*We* do not oppose error; *we* never cast any "slur" upon error; we leave that to the Tractarians. And so let it be, if our opponents are determined upon this view of the question; the Tractarians have no objection to be considered decidedly *for* truth and *against* "error." *They* can have no objection to the decision of Convocation in June being called "the success of the Tractarians," or to have the contest described as being between "*those whose object it is to unprotestantize the National Church, and those who would maintain the cause of Protestantism against them.*"† What? identify the cause of Dr. Hampden and his "error" with the cause of Protestantism! and opposition to him to be considered opposition to Protestantism! An uncomplimentary alliance, surely, for the latter. But Dr. Hampden, we presume, is now standing on his innocent leg, and has never been in error. Or is it a mistake, in their view, to *consider* what he held to *be* error, and not rather Protestantism?

We are literally ashamed of the task we have been engaged in, of dissecting such a mass of contradiction; but it was proper it should be gone through. They first *feel* that Dr. Hampden was an altered man, then that he had never held any thing to alter; first, that Dr. Hampden had "rectified his error," and then that he had never any error to rectify. In short, they do not seem to have made up their minds what to *feel* on the subject; and almost the only certainty they let out is, that they *feel* they have got upon "*difficult ground;*" where for the present we shall leave them.

So much for one section of Dr. Hampden's supporters: we turn now to the higher one which originated the movement. Far be it from us to attempt to raise any cry against the Board

* Record, June 9. † Ibid.

of Heads of Houses at Oxford; we are too conscious of the whole Church's long connivance at the spirit which produced that movement, to lay the exclusive blame of it on any particular body. Particular bodies show certain tendencies in the general system to which they belong; they never act without something to appeal to, some ground of support, in the recognized tone of opinion around them. All of us are responsible for what goes on amongst us. We know of more than one vote given at the Board on that occasion in favour of Dr. Hampden on motives of the purest good-nature, as far removed as possible from any kind of liberalism. Still, when a body commits itself in public and formal acts, it must expect to be judged by those acts: *as* a body it represents, and we cannot but view it as the representative of, certain principles. No respect, then, for the members of the Hebdomadal Board, as individuals, can prevent us from stating our opinion that a succession of acts for some years past, crowned by this attempt to abolish the University's formal and unanimous censure of heterodoxy in 1836, have disclosed a latitudinarian bias in the temper of that Board. Every one knows the progress which the latitudinarianism, admitted into our Church at the revolution of 1688, made during the last century; the more dangerously because it was united with much respect for the Church, as a human institution. The divines whom King William III. introduced in the place of the Hammonds, the Taylors, and the Kens—the school of Hoadley, and their successors, were all admirers of establishments and state religions; they only wished to separate them from whatever was divine in constitution and doctrine, from church independence, and a dogmatic or authoritative creed. This spirit it was which dictated the attempt to abolish subscription to the Articles in 1772; an attempt which was supported so generally, and by persons of such name, station and authority, that the wonder is how it was frustrated. Nevertheless, it was; the spirit subsided for a time; and whether it was the dread of French infidelity, or any other cause, which made us adhere a little closer to our creeds, it did not break out into any open attempts till about a dozen years ago. It then manifested itself in the legislature by the repeal of the test and corporation, and Roman Catholic emancipation acts, and in the nation at large in the shape of innumerable schemes of Church reform, affecting the most vital points of discipline and doctrine—the Athanasian Creed being specially singled out for general reprobation. Such sentiments were not long in eating their way into the Church, and in 1835 an attempt was made by the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford, in compliance with the demands of public opinion, to abolish undergraduate

subscription to the Articles. The proposal, we need not tell our readers, was indignantly rejected: who that was present in the theatre on that occasion can ever forget the storm of *non placets* which burst with uncontrollable vehemence from the waving field of heads below, and the thunder of the "*non, non, non,*" twenty times repeated, which almost shook the building. The same strong feeling which displayed itself on this occasion extorted the censure of Dr. Hampden the year following; but it was felt at the time that a concession reluctantly made to the "lower house" would not be respected long; and that as the Regius Professor and Head of St. Mary Hall mixed more and more in society with his fellow heads, the feeling of *class* would prevail, and the dignitary supersede and cover the latitudinarian. And, accordingly, six years afterwards, we have a proposal made for removing Dr. Hampden's stigma, without a single reason stated; but the latent premise, we presume, being—We have been on terms with him for so long; he has been to our table and we to his; and he seems much like other people in point of religion—it is unreality and trifling to condemn or brand a man whom we regard as one of ourselves. A very natural mode of arguing, we allow, nay, and very just and conclusive, *upon the premises*—but it is not in this way that the succession of orthodox doctrine in the Church has been preserved. This is just the kind of reasoning which, in different forms, has been secularizing the Church for the last 150 years, and which, if it were to go on unchecked, would leave us eventually nothing but the dead trunk of an establishment. Even when used in no worse meaning than that of vague goodnature, it is sure to render a body the easy tool of any *real and systematic* latitudinarians there may be among its members. But it signifies little how the propounders of the statute may have reasoned; the *act* is enough; it tells its own tale. So far as the genius of the eighteenth century still survives, so far must it appear that the Hebdomadal Board has publicly constituted itself the representative of the Hoadleian, the latitudinarian-establishment spirit within the Church.

Such, then, was the union of schools that supported the cause of Dr. Hampden in the contest of June last—an occasion which we take to be as fair a criterion of the state of religious parties as any we have had. On the one side were the evangelicals allied with the latitudinarians, the Puritans of the seventeeth century with the establishment party of the eighteenth; on the other were the modern representatives of the strictest and at the same time the most authoritative divinity of our Church. It is satisfactory to see the battle reduced to so simple a form.

Art. V.—1. *The History of Pews. A Paper read before the Cambridge Camden Society, on Monday, November* 22, 1841. *With an Appendix, containing a Report presented to the Society on the Statistics of Pews.* Second Edition, with Additions. Cambridge, Stevenson; Oxford, Parker. 1842.

2. *Twenty-three Reasons for getting rid of Church Pews.* Stevenson, Cambridge.

3. *The Ecclesiologist.* Vol. I.

4. *A Practical Guide to the Duties of Churchwardens in the Execution of their Office.* By Charles Grevile Prideaux, of Baliol College, Oxford, M. A., and of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: Shaw and Sons. 1841.

5. *Milford Malvoisin; or, Pews and Pewholders.* By Francis E. Paget, M. A., Rector of Elford, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. Third Edition. London: Burns. 1842.

6. *Charge by Archdeacon Hare.* 1841.

7. *A Charge delivered at the ordinary Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Chichester, in July,* 1842. By Henry Edward Manning, M.A., Archdeacon of Chichester. London: Murray.

8. *Suggestions and Instructions of the Incorporated Society for Promoting the Enlargement, Building, and Repairing of Churches and Chapels. As Amended, May,* 1842.

If any foreign Catholic wished to prove, from outward appearances, the thoroughly secular character of the English Establishment, he need only ask one to enter the first church he came to, whether in town or country, except in some very primitive district. How strange is the sight it usually presents, even to one not unaccustomed to it, and in a manner blind to its deformities! Here is a church, which outwardly, perhaps, remains the same as its ancient founders made it. Perhaps not a stone unchanged—not a trace of intervening ages, except the moss and lichen that mantle over the walls. We know not how long the ground has been sacred, and separate from worldly uses, worldly thoughts and passions. For what we know, the spot may have had its solemn appropriation, and may have been the hallowed ground of some deity of Gentile tradition, for as many centuries before the name of Christ was heard in this land, as have since passed over it. Under some name, false or true, it may have been venerated, gently trod upon, and gently spoken upon, as the vestibule

of heaven, and the very inhabitation of Divinity, for more than half the duration of this earthly sphere. Its distinctive character, therefore, though a creation of mind, and appealing only to the moral part of men, may be as immeasurably and immemorially old, and, to all human intents and purposes, as eternal, as the everlasting hills, the ancient rivers, and the impassable barriers that withstand the ocean's ceaseless rage.

Enter the church, and what does its interior present in keeping with our association. There is just enough, though barely enough, to show that the place is still sacred, and still frequented as the throne of grace. Yet the world is as manifestly in possession. As idol shrines were suffered in the Temple to divide the honour due to God, so here too Mammon has a portion of the occupation and honour. Wealth, and rank, and family pride, comfort and indolence, here are worshipped. You feel you have not parted from the world when you came in. It has rushed in after you like a flood. All that was odious or miserable in the town or the village, is here also. The ancient sanctity of the spot is overgrown and hidden with modern profanities. They who come here, surely, to judge from appearances, bring with them their vices, their pride, their luxuries, and doubtless also their cares. Is this the gate of heaven? Is it here that the ladder is planted to the skies which angels traverse to and fro? It is impossible, if at least one is to judge from appearances. Let us contemplate in detail this modern use of ancient sanctity.

Divesting ourselves of such solemn associations, we will go at once into the subject before us, and enter not one, but some fifty churches, in towns and villages, and relate the result of our inquiries. We believe we may say that our examples are taken at random, and may be considered a fair specimen of the general state of things. They are all substantially true, which is all the truth that under the circumstances would be advisable; but we are sure every one who has visited any number of churches will be able to verify our account of the state of things, out of his own experience. As we have a good deal of work before us, we hope the fastidious reader will excuse the haste with which we rush into such ungainly details, and also the little appearance of method and order we have been able to give them.

An instance before us is a small village church, without aisles, and therefore very long in proportion to its width; on each side the narrow passage are four large square pews, occupying the four first positions reckoning downwards from the chancel arch—the eight pews obviously of very recent date, and disclosing by the wood work that they have been manufactured each out of two or three pews of less

grasping dimensions. They are very scantily occupied, here and there a farmer and his wife, or a son or a daughter. Below them, i. e. 25 or 30 feet from the reading desk, begin the smaller pews of the smaller people, which uniformly are better occupied the lower you go down towards the west end, because occupied on more open principles. The old and infirm, the deaf and half-blind, and helpless, are sitting here and there, under the gallery, in the darkest, the coldest and most distant place, where they can least hear and see, and are about as uncomfortable as they can easily be. We have seen half a dozen such old men, rheumatic and deaf, which nearly all out-door labourers are long before they reach sixty, sitting remote and dreary on stone steps, old boxes, or on the bier which is so soon to carry them, under the tower, some 20 or 30 feet further back than the singers' gallery, and apparently incapable of joining in the service, except by intuitive sympathy. The stouter labourers, and all the lads of an age to think themselves men, of course frequent the gallery, the fashionable tone of which it is well known is about as undevotional as the appearance is offensive. The children are in the passages, avenging themselves for the discomfort of their position by communicating as much of it as they can to all in their immediate precincts; or they are in the chancel, sitting, may be, on what should be a kneeling board for the communicants, but is converted for the use of the Sunday school into a mere bench. The labourers' wives have *no* provision made for them, and too generally consider themselves specially dispensed from attendance.

We lately visited the church of an extensive rural parish. It was a building of very fair proportions, some pretensions to dignity, and of the usual divers degrees of antiquity. Properly and decently arranged for service, it would have been all that one can wish for a country church. It consisted of a nave about 50 by 20, with tower, north aisle, and chancel. The chancel was filled with square pews, allowing a passage of about a yard to the altar. One of the pews was very large, with a great deal of wood work of a very domestic appearance, and half hiding a good decorated window, the only side window in the chancel. It appeared these pews were in the presumed possession of a person who owned the ground whereon had once stood a mansion, built a century since by the lay impropriator, the said ground being now separated from the tithes, though made itself tithe-free. The aisle was filled with large square pews, lined with all sorts of colours; and choking up the handsome tower arch was a large gallery about a century old, curiously flanked by a small private gallery, with a private staircase, extending into the aisle. There was no clerestory;

so the fault of the nave was want of light, an evil not a little aggravated by these structures. The nave was full of enclosures of every class of irregularity and uncouthness, from a manorial pew of the date of James I., down to the worm-eaten elm boarding nailed upon the old oak seats. There were pews for one, for two, for a dozen, and for sixteen, One was not surprised to hear there had been a demand for more accommodation. There had been, and this had led to the great eye-sore of the church. In the nave, over the south entrance, and along the south wall, was a gallery 18 feet long, and 8 feet deep, containing 4 benches, about 23 inches apart, facing the north, and directly overlooking the pulpit. This was built about twenty years since with the assistance of a grant from the Incorporated Society,—a grant allowed on the allegation that church room was absolutely wanted, and that the said gallery supplied *sixty-nine* new sittings. After the statement of the dimensions it may appear strange that an area of not quite 150 square feet, from which a staircase and the passage are to be deducted, could hold so many persons. In fact thirty-nine were all the gallery would really hold, with any tolerable ease; but the builder at the completion of his job gathered together all the men, women and children he could get at, sent them up into the gallery, till the accumulated mass refused further compression, and then counted heads as they came down. We shall scarcely gain credit for what we have now to tell. Almost under this gallery, i. e. on the same side, and filling up the space between it and the chancel arch, was an immense pew more than 8 feet square, with a projection into the chancel. Its capacity was more than half the available capacity of the gallery just described, and it was in the best part of the church, the best for light and hearing, and propinquity to the chancel. At the time of our visit this empire of a pew was and had been for years occupied by one lady,—one only,—not a creature besides: and she had no more legal right to it than the humblest school girl perched up in the dark, unhealthy, suffocating gallery. The small beginnings and first pretensions of this monstrous usurpation were hid in the dark ages of the Georgian era; but the finishing stroke was of about thirty years' prescription. Till about 1810 there were two pews on the site, one appertaining to a certain outlying farm, the other to a mansion in the village. The old house on the farm was then converted into a nest of cottages, the inhabitants of which did not occupy the pew,—probably did not venture to do so. It was thereupon added to the mansion pew. A new house has lately been built on the farm, the occupant of which is in want of a pew;

and unless the Camden Society or something as efficient prevents him, he will probably succeed in getting, *not* the site formerly appropriated to that farm, which we should think quite bad enough, but some other site cleared for him, by driving away half a dozen aboriginal old men and women and other helpless people.

Many a curious history, illustrative of changes of manners, and rise and fall of rural dynasties, might be made out of the alterations of the pewing in a village church, where there are documents to explain them. A large portion of our churches were entirely new seated in those not very auspicious eras, the early and the latter parts of the seventeenth century. The seating was very uniform both in dimensions and style, with an exception perhaps in favour of the lord of the manor, and one or two others. Often there was no exception. It was not an uncommon rule to appropriate all the seats on the north side to the men, and those on the south to the women; naming the particular *farms*, or subordinate manors, to which the several seats were assigned, and making no difference between masters and servants. Such was the simple substratum on which subsequent innovations were made, and great and anomalous have those innovations been. First, if there was not a great man's pew, one has been made either by the process of accumulation, or by encroaching into the chancel, though the solid remains of the old rood screen have generally checked the progress of acquisition in that direction. If there was a great man's pew in the original scheme, it has been amplified. The sittings appropriated to the occupiers and labourers *on* certain farms, were monopolized by the landowners or chief tenants, for their own households. The sittings on the other side of the aisle, appropriated to the women on the farm, were in like manner secured for the *servants* in those households. By and by, several smaller farms were respectively attached to greater, and the houses were pulled down or converted into cottages, the farmers themselves disappearing, or becoming labourers. The pews were then placed under the absolute control of the owners and occupiers of the several augmented properties. They were either thrown into the larger farmers' pews, or were assigned to bailiffs, or dependent shopkeepers; any how, a presumption of private and personal right was created, or rather made inveterate. As all the labourers, old and young, were expelled in the course of these innovations, something was to be done for them, and the least expensive plan was to build a gallery, which, in nine cases out of ten, was built not so much to accommodate an increasing population, as to admit of the separation of master and servant, and to allow the master class to have twice as much space as they could actually occupy. It must be added, that two or three pews or

seats were destroyed to make room for the gallery stairs, besides that the other pews under the gallery became much less usable.

Pews and galleries always go together. The former have made the latter necessary, being an evil remedy for an evil disease. Galleries are as the plague which in ancient times always trod upon the steps of famine. They are never necessary; they cannot be; for the plain reason, that when a church is full it is possible to enlarge it, or to build another. When the congregation really fills the church, this ought to be done. But in matter of fact it seldom comes to this. It is seldom allowed to come to this. Generally before the congregation has half filled the floor of the church, a gallery has been declared necessary. The "respectable" people could not all be provided with "pews," and were beginning to quarrel in church. So for the peace and satisfaction of the respectable portion, the church was divided into pews, and the bulk of the congregation banished to a gallery, or to the meeting house. We are speaking more of rural than of town churches; but what we are saying holds good with regard to the latter also to a great extent. We have, however, village churches chiefly in our eye, remembering that the changes now taking place in village churches, and the continual increase of misappropriation and monopoly which even the last ten years have seen, have taken place in town churches so long since, that we can only see and deplore the result. We say, then, that the ground has been pewed, and the gallery built, not to make *room*, properly so called, in the simple sense of the word, but spare room, elbow room, roominess, room for luxury, room for pomp, room to look about and move about in, all for a comparatively few persons, for the wealthier and more assuming class.

Without having recourse to the exact measurements and calculations of the Camden Society, any one may see that in most cases galleries, whether in old or new churches, are not necessary for accommodation simple, but only for accommodation exclusive and luxurious. They are entailed not by the number of the congregation, but by the use of pews. If there were none of those feelings, whatever they are, which make people require certain seats and certain spaces of their own, there would seldom be even a pretence for galleries. We were lately in a very large and handsome church with an area large enough to contain 1200 or 1300, and an organ-loft that would probably hold 200 more. The organ-loft had just been flanked with galleries for the school children, which were of course crowded with their restless little occupants. But in the said organ-loft itself there were literally not ten persons besides a few paid singers; and in the area of the church there were not more than 300, scattered here and there among the spa-

cious pews. Take, again, the case of a chapel of ease in a parish of 7000, built at the cost of 10,000*l.*—we forget how much of which was a parliamentary grant—and designed to hold 1400, every sacrifice being made to capacity in the way of deep galleries west, north, and south. On a Sunday morning of this present year, when the mother church happened to be closed for repairs, and when, consequently, the congregation included many from the mother church, the following was the result of a careful numbering:

In each side gallery, exclusive of school children—40	80
Sunday-school girls in the west gallery, and round the corners in the side galleries, including a portion from the mother church	150
Sunday-school boys under the west and side galleries, partly computed, not more than	150
In each half of the area from the nave passage to the wall, including both pews and "free sittings"—120	240
In the "free sittings" *in* the nave passage	25
	645

Now it is evident that with open benches and a really open *system* of occupation, the whole would have been easily accommodated on the ground, and the 2000*l.* or 3000*l.* spent on the galleries might have gone to create a fund for the minister's income, instead of making it depend on pew rents.

The chancel is subject to evils of its own. Sometimes it is filled with square pews, made by the successive lessees of the great tithes for one or two centuries. Each family has retained its pew, after it has ceased to rent the tithes. Sometimes a lessee of rather a higher class, or with more than ordinary spirit of encroachment, has made a large pew for his servants as well as for himself, both of which he retains though no longer lessee. These pews are of course square, often raised a step or two from the floor of the chancel, with walls or curtains six feet high, and reducing the chancel passage to the width of four feet or less, so that if the nave happens to have a passage of rather ampler space than common, its effect is destroyed by the narrow straight of the chancel. The altar is of course completely hidden, and if the "communion service" is read from the altar, the clergyman cannot be seen, and can scarcely be heard; while at the actual celebration of the Eucharist, the communicants are sadly inconvenienced both in their approach, and before the altar. These pews come perhaps within two feet of the rail; nay, not unfrequently quite up to the east end, thereby taking so much from the altar rail; and we have even seen the altar, rail, and every thing removed, and the whole made one spacious family

pew, with a very small deal table or board, usually stowed away in some corner of the church, and brought for the occasion to the middle of the said family pew.

Frequently the church has been repaired at no very great distance of time. The squire has been the chief contributor to the expense, and has of course secured the goodwill of the clergyman; besides that he has had this hold on the clergyman, that if he apprehended things would not be done entirely to his mind, he could, by his influence in the vestry, put an absolute veto on the whole proceeding—a power of which nineteen squires out of twenty would not hesitate to avail themselves. Armed with this panoply of money and influence, and being a very good natured and persuasive as well as a very determined gentleman, and also "a very good churchman," the squire has laid violent hands on two, three, four, five, or six pews adjoining his own, in the very centre of the church, respectively occupied by his tenants or dependents, and thrown them all into one vast field, spacious enough to turn a coach and six in, and accommodate perhaps thirty persons, though never to be occupied by more than ten, and rarely by two or three. Of course a general move downwards is the result of this proceeding; the former occupiers of the space now converted into this sort of church park, are located elsewhere, to the exclusion of others, till the last links of the series are sent under the tower, or behind some massive piers, or into some other comfortless corner. "Free sittings" have accordingly been constructed in these distant and out-of-the-way places; and are not the least valuable part of the arrangement, as though little likely to be really occupied, they are *the* ground on which grants have been claimed and received from the diocesan and incorporated societies; inasmuch as reckoning the squire's pew at the same capacity as the pews whose space it occupies, the new "free sittings" are, *on the scheme*, so much additional accommodation. The squire's pew, with its handsome brass rods and bars, crimson curtains, and other decorations, not omitting its table, stove, and chimney pipe, is henceforth the chief ornament of the church.

In the illness of the incumbent, a curate comes to a splendid town church for a couple of years. He is a very liberal minded and spirited personage, and with the utmost spirit and on the most liberal principles, proceeds to make all sorts of alterations in the church, with a view to more convenience and accommodation. He builds new galleries, takes down the chancel screen, puts the pulpit more immediately and closely before the altar than it was before, fills the passage of the nave with benches and moveable ledges, &c. &c. We are not however concerned with what he

does, but with what he *allows*. A wealthy lawyer, who has not a few of the country gentlemen and the town tradesmen in his list of mortgages, happens to be the proprietor of two houses, to which appertain the two best and most spacious pews in the church, just before the reading desk. One of the houses is let to the frequenter of a favourite chapel of ease, the other to a dissenter: accordingly the lawyer attaches the pew he has hitherto occupied himself to a third house in his possession, and without saying a word to anybody, without expecting or meeting with the smallest interruption, proceeds to throw the two chief pews aforesaid into one large square one, which he cannot at present more than a quarter fill, and which he expects to fill still less bye and bye, on the settlement elsewhere of his only daughter, and two only sons.

Pews of more than usual dimensions, that have been appropriated from time immemorial to more than one family, or to a number of separate heads, are frequently monopolized by one family, or one person, by much the same process. The weaker yields to the stronger, and there is nobody at hand to assist the weak. The clergyman, the churchwardens, the influential people, are either blind or stupid to all church interests and purposes, or on friendly terms with the aggressor. Changes of property and residence of any kind give pretence and opportunity for the acquisition of one, two, or half a dozen sittings. A poor widow vacates by death twenty inches of sitting, and a friend, a child, or a hat, sufficiently scares away any other widow who might attempt to occupy, till half a year's prescription has established the right.

Many a spacious square pew might be traced to the appropriation of a single sitting. The snowball process of accumulation, so common in human affairs, is not the least observable in churches. One sitting is added to another, and a third to them; these, with or without the kindly intervention of the churchwarden, are commuted or amalgamated into a single pew, and so on, to the wished-for conclusion. The first step is of course to put a door to the open seat, when it becomes a pew. Sometimes, however, single "sitters" are obstinate, and spoil the symmetry of the arrangement. Hence the peculiar awkwardness we have often seen in pews constructed in the midst of open sittings. Some of these arrangements for the aggregation and circumvallation of several open sittings, and for securing an independent approach to them, are so extraordinary, that we despair of making them intelligible without diagrams. We have seen three sittings, viz. two in two separate benches in the nave, and one in an adjacent bench in an aisle, converted into one, in and out, six cornered pew; also pews severally made out of only two sittings,

either in the same or in neighbouring benches; also pews made out of four sittings, namely, two in one bench, and two in the bench before; and we are well acquainted with a pew made along the wall, by robbing three open benches of their innermost sittings. If it should happen, as it does frequently, that the various pews of smaller capacity which it is wished to amalgamate into that *beau ideal* of church accommodation—a large square pew—are not conveniently situate for the arrangement, an exchange is frequently effected. The friendly pew proprietors respectively give and take, and thus bring each their several pew properties to a "ring fence," *i. e.* to one large square pew.

The clergyman, on his return to his parish after a month's absence, finds that the squire has sent his carpenter into the church, who has turned the pews of the squire's two principal tenants into one pew for the squire's servants. Provision has been made for the said tenants by displacing two inferior tenants, who in the progress downwards displace near a dozen poor men and women, who find places here and there where they can, some leaving church altogether. The squire only resides at his seat three months in the year; consequently for nine months in the year the new seat is wholly unoccupied. Bye and bye the squire breaks up his establishment, tries to let his house, does not succeed, and for a dozen years the new pew immediately under the reading desk is never once used.

The wealthy carpenter of the village becomes possessor of the house and the pew next his own. He lets the house without the pew, and without dreaming that what he is doing is in the smallest degree objectionable, or that the resident curate has any voice in the matter, he takes down the partition, and makes for himself a pew as good as Mr. Such-a-one's. His family consists of a son who never goes to church, and a daughter who shortly marries away from the village, when the occupancy of a pew large enough for a dozen is reduced to the proprietor's own and sole Sunday morning's attendance.

The proprietor of a house and land, and consequently of a pew, builds on speculation a smaller house on his land, lets it, and easily obtains for it a second pew, out of which some poor persons have been removed for the purpose. The whole becomes in a few years the property of a stranger, who converts the two pews into one for his own "use," and procures accommodation for the occupiers of the smaller house by getting another batch of poor persons sent adrift in the passages and corners of the church.

The appropriation of a seat or a single sitting to a person, though in itself a most unexceptionable proceeding, is a step to encroachment. By almost imperceptible transition it becomes

appropriated to the house, and thence with still greater facility is considered the property of the owner of that house, whether he be the occupier or not. The owner of half a dozen smaller houses or cottages looks upon *his* pews exactly as he looks upon *his* cottages. He does just what he likes with them. He re-arranges them, or re-appropriates them, or if there is a remunerating demand he lets them, or sells them; he takes them for his servants, for himself, for a non-parishioner, for anybody or for nobody. Indeed it is not a very uncommon occurrence for a considerable portion of a church to be empty Sunday after Sunday, from a deliberate design of the "proprietor" to injure the Church or hurt the feelings of the clergyman, the said "proprietor" being a Dissenter, or at personal variance with the clergyman, and having accordingly "determined that nobody shall occupy those seats as long as he lives."

From time immemorial a certain aisle, or small transept, or particular district of the church, has been assigned to a certain outlying hamlet, and, as it happens, has been the best frequented part of the church; so often it is found that people will most tenaciously use that which looks like a privilege, and is a matter of difficulty. A great man has built a great house in the hamlet, converted the farm into a park, and transplanted the cottagers to the mother village near the church. Of course he has converted the transept, or whatever it be, into two pews, one for his family, and one for his servants: or perhaps he has rebuilt the transept or chantry with brick, after an Italian or modern Gothic design, and divided it into two stories, converting the ground floor into a cemetery, and the upper floor into a well carpeted, cushioned, curtained, and fire-placed pew, with a vestibule, and two staircases, one to the outside, and the other to the floor of the church. The two or three dozen former occupants of the site, who have been, of course, most reasonably and most amicably ousted, are left to shift for themselves, and for the future, instead of being the best church goers, are the very worst.

We will observe, by the way, that for this, as for all our illustrations, we could produce abundance of proof, if it were necessary. We possess the names and other particulars. But our purpose is merely to impress on our readers, by an enumeration of examples, the great extent and manifold character of the evil. We are persuaded that instances under all these heads are so numerous that some will occur to every mind. Under some of these heads we could adduce many separate instances. But we are anxious not to indicate and show up to public attention the parties concerned, and should be sorry if any one fancied he recognized the particular case we had in view. Most pro-

bably he would be mistaken. An unnecessary obtrusion of private names could only serve to gratify some ill feeling; and it must be considered that things in themselves the most outrageously unjust or ridiculous have often been done in thoughtlessness and ignorance, and often because those whose province it was to inform the public conscience and taste have lamentably failed to do so. We could render these pages much more *piquant* by introducing the name of the particular peer or baronet who had erected a pew of two stories—one for the dead, the other for the living members of his family; and of course we could easily introduce the name and describe the proceeding so ingeniously as to leave the reader to supply the proper terms of censure; but we know of no useful or justifiable end that would be answered by our doing so.

A number of persons in a country town obtain consent of vestry, and a consequent faculty for building a gallery. They are to pay the carpenter's bill, and it is assumed in consequence, without a thought to the contrary, that the gallery is actually built at their sole expense, and it is inferred, that they have a consequent right of possession. They apply to the bishop's court for as much right as can be given, and think they have an undoubted claim to an absolute freehold. Happily the official who draws up the faculty, without much troubling himself with the reason of the thing, goes by some form or precedent, and gives but a very qualified right, *i. e.* a merely ecclesiastical right—perhaps a grant of occupation to the persons applying for the faculty, and to their families, as long as they reside in the parish. The applicants are disappointed — murmur about necessity of reform, antiquated usages, stupid technicalities, troublesome proctors, and so forth; but soon forget their disappointment. They do forget their disappointment indeed; for in a course of twenty or thirty years, all those pews are bought and sold as freely as if they were tables and chairs, or sheep and oxen, to members of the original families, or to strangers, with houses or without houses, to parishioners or non-parishioners, in any way that may suit the convenience of the buyers and sellers. We have known pews in a gallery, not more than thirty or forty years old, sell at the rate of twenty guineas a sitting, and let accordingly, though the original cost would not be a tenth of that, and though the supposed *right* was utterly visionary. We have also known a gallery in an ancient parish church pass so completely into the occupation of non-parishioners, that the vicar and a wealthy layman purchased it at the cost of 600*l.* or 700*l.*, in order to secure it for parishioners, expecting, of course, to be repaid for the outlay by the rent of the pews; though, as it eventually turned out, they might as well have

undertaken to buy the church itself. They had in fact nothing for their money but so much waste paper, excepting, that as the act was kindly and generously intended, doubtless they were not unrewarded.

A large family comes into a parish, and with no small parade of reason and justice and parochial principles claims suitable accommodation, which, to the inconvenience of several defenceless persons, is granted to it in the shape of a large and commodious square pew. In a few years the family dwindles, or becomes semi-dissenting, or leaves the parish, and the large pew remains attached to the house, either entirely or nearly deserted. And we should expect it would not be easy to find in the whole history of pews a single record of a pew, acquired in the way we describe, *i. e.* on the allegation of justice and public good, being spontaneously or even contentedly resigned on the same grounds: *i. e.* we have never yet heard of a pew acquired on the ground of number given up on the ground of want of number. The pew then, after being a convenience and a piece of justice for ten years, becomes a nuisance and a flagrant injustice for a century, if it ceases even then. The evil however does not end with the pew itself. It is only the "beginning of the end." No sooner has Mr. A. on the strength of a numerous family procured the formation and grant of a sufficient pew, but Messrs. B., C. and D. who are more than his equals in wealth, rank and standing, look upon it with an eye of jealousy. Mr. B., to be sure, is a bachelor, and generally avails himself of a Sunday to visit his distant acquaintances; Mr. C. has but a wife and one daughter, and Mr. D.'s family is only numerous in perspective; yet the mere instinct of imitation carries them on, and within a few years after the first mentioned arrangement three other square pews disfigure and desolate the area of the church.

A farmer takes a hundred acres in one parish, and a small house convenient for his land in another. By virtue of his hundred acres he has a good sized pew in the church of the first parish, but in the church of the last parish has only his chance with the commonalty, which the previous occupiers of the house were amply content with. He comes to her ladyship's steward, and amongst other requests, such as that he may have the reversion of a certain close of accommodation land, and such a cottage for his carter, and such a quantity of drainage done for him, and so forth, he further asks for a pew suitable to his rank, in the church to which his house belongs. The steward, who thinks with a degree of truth that he can manage everything under the sun, speaks a word to the churchwarden, who is also one of her ladyship's tenants, and also an expectant of reversionary favours. The church-

warden looks about him, and casts his eyes on a good sized pew near the reading desk. It attracts his attention, from the very circumstance of its being always fully and miscellaneously occupied, and therefore not monopolized by any man, house, or property. The occupants in fact are a middle-aged spinster, who gets her living by teaching the art of lace-making to a dozen or two children, the daughter of a retired publican, a blind old man and his deaf wife, and two other not particularly influential persons. They are warned off the premises. For three months the pew is empty; then the farmer makes his appearance with a couple of friends from a distance; after an interval of several Sundays, the farmer's wife comes to Church once or twice; after a longer interval, their maid of all work comes twice or thrice; and then for three years the pew is not once entered. The clergyman, who is repeatedly applied to by the poorer sort for sittings, is rather annoyed to see just under him a pew which was once so well filled now always empty. At first he takes for granted that the farmer frequents the church wherein his land is situate. On inquiry, however, from his brother clergyman, he finds the pew appertaining to the land is always empty. The fact is, that the farmer often has a carousal on Saturday evening, from which he is late recovering on Sunday morning, and generally dines just before afternoon service. Sunday is also his day for visiting or receiving his friends; and so, either because he is "at home" or abroad, he never comes to church. The clergyman fidgets and vexes himself a good deal at finding the true state of things, and ventures one day, after saying a word or two about coming to church, to hint at the reasonableness of giving up a pew which is never used. The farmer stares at him, says Mr. Such-a-one, the steward, found him the pew, and he supposes there won't be any alteration. So the matter ends.

A large farmer has no family, and only one permanent household servant. Under these circumstances it might be supposed that he would require all the less room for himself and his servants. Very far from it. He takes to himself the large square pew appertaining to his farm. The question then is, what to do with his single servant or "housekeeper," as she is called, who, on Sunday afternoon in church, and at a village tea party, is a very fine lady. She is not to be confounded with labourers' wives and daughters, and yet must keep her distance towards her master. Accordingly he procures for her a distinct pew, in which she holds solitary state, as far as so well-dressed a body can be considered solitary; for, like the wise man in solitude, she is her own best company. She then, in her turn, negociates the perpetual settlement of a sitting in another part of the church,—for the

three members of the household, as far as their number will allow, are playing at "puss in the corner,"—for the third member of the household, acting as kitchen wench and errand girl—a sort of corporation sole, continually renewed from the rising generation of the village. All this is absurd enough, even while the peculiar state of Mr. Such-a-one's household seems to justify so peculiar an arrangement; but unhappily, as in other cases, the appropriation of the pews continues long after the first pretence has ceased and been forgotten.

It is by no means an unusual thing, where parishes are small, and many in the hands of one great proprietor, or where the parishes are severally much subdivided into distinct holdings or properties, for one person to have two or three or even four pews in so many different churches, some of which, perhaps all, he never enters.

Another very common abuse, which may not indeed produce such flagrant inconveniences, *i. e.* may not work so ill, is yet as gross an usurpation as any we have mentioned. A parish is divided between two proprietors, whose tenants, great and small, have, at some period not very remote, squabbled about seats in the church: what was the process and rationale of settlement does not appear, but the result is as follows. You enter the church, and find, besides a few large pews for gentlemen and yeomen, a good proportion of open sittings, every one of which, without exception, has either L. M. or C. S. daubed in large white paint at the back. You inquire, and are told that all the former sittings are at the absolute disposal of Colonel Maitland, one of the proprietors, and all the latter equally appertain to Mr. Sutton, the other. So long as these two gentlemen are what they are now, all may go on well enough; but if one of them should take offence at the clergyman, or turn preacher himself, or become a champion of "the voluntary principle," then his intra-ecclesiastical power becomes a formidable engine, of which he does not hesitate to avail himself. We know of a dissenting proprietor keeping half a dozen pews locked up in his parish church for years; and if the nuisance is not at this day unabated, it is owing to a change of ownership.

We have said that a history of the changes of families and estates for many generations might often be made out of the appearance of the pews. Sometimes they exactly represent the present state of the property. There is a church in which the chancel is choked with square pews belonging to the lessee of the great tithes, who literally claims the right to lock the incumbent out of the chancel at discretion, the living being a peculiar, and the ordinary as well as the rector a layman. No vicar's pew, because no resident

clergyman for ages till lately. Half-a-dozen large pews at the top of the nave belong to the chief tenants. Below them are the remains of ancient open seats all down the nave, with this peculiarity, that the eight or nine next the square pews have been modernized with additional backs and with doors made of plain elm boards. On inquiry it appears that these are monopolized by the holders of "the livings," a peculiar set of small leasehold farms. The seat next below these last, almost under the gallery, is pointed out as the place where the clergyman's sisters are content to take their place. In another instance a similar organization and appropriation of pews indicates the holders of "the Trinity commons," which once were certain rights of pasturage and tillage on the open down, but are now commuted into small inclosed farms of equal value.

It is pretty generally admitted by this time, that whatever is done with regard to pews must be done in the way of prevention. The evil once allowed is incurable. It must therefore be nipped in the bud. There is nothing which people defend with so much pertinacity as a pew. The more unreasonable, the more unjust in theory, the greater outrage it is to public convenience and to the symmetry of the building, the greater hindrance to the general seeing and hearing, the more is it cherished. A square pew is more valuable so far as it is square; and with high walls is more precious still; its value is increased if it is exactly under the chancel arch; it is worth more still if it blocks up a handsome window, or if there is an unsightly canopy over it; much more honourable is it if it be a gallery with a separate staircase, which destroys several sittings, and hinders a good many people from seeing and hearing. The situation of a gallery pew is also considered. The circumstance of its being directly opposite the pulpit, or directly behind it, so as to enable the occupants to overlook the preacher's manuscript, greatly contributes to the air of distinction: much more does the circumstance of its stretching across the chancel in the place of the ancient rood loft. A separate entrance into the church, made perhaps through a handsome window, and with a very ugly staircase outside, which is such an eyesore as to monopolize the attention of all strangers on first seeing the church, is a very great prize. But perhaps the very summit of Anglican ambition, and the very thing of which an English nobleman or gentleman has most reason to be proud, and which he will therefore maintain with far greater tenacity than he will his creed, his honour, or his life itself, is an immense faculty pew raised just ten or twelve feet from the floor, and filling up the whole of the quadrangular space between the four piers that support the tower of an ancient cruciform church.

To these four piers the four corners of the pew are of course most injuriously attached, and there is no other appearance of support, the cumbrous staircase being placed in one of the aisles. The advantage of this situation is, that it commands the whole church, being the most prominent object from every quarter, nave, chancel, and transepts, and every where closing the vista. By being thus the greatest possible impediment to the congregation, and the greatest possible desight to the structure, it illustrates all the more forcibly the power, grandeur, and sacredness of the family to which it appertains, in comparison with the power of the people, the grandeur of the state, and the sacredness of the church. The congregation, to whose prejudice the pew was erected, the bishop who granted the faculty, the church which it spoilt, all appear the merest trifles compared with a family, which so much as a matter of course triumphs over them. They are only just important enough to swell its pomp. It need scarcely be added, that the *prestige* of the affair is wonderfully augmented if the pew is never used from one year's end to another.

A clergyman ought to know who are in church; and with a practised pastoral eye, if there be no impediment, he will easily accomplish a complete survey of his congregation in a few glances round the church. He knows of course where people are to be found, and cannot help remarking vacancies and new faces. A very few glances are all he has time for, as he commonly has to go through the whole service without assistance; he is allowed no pause, and cannot with propriety or pleasure look about him during the singing. But then the church should present no impediment to such a survey. Every body should be visible, even when sitting, and every body should be *in* the light, and under the light. Pews and galleries always more or less interfere with the facility, which in this case is tantamount to the possibility, of this survey. We are familiar with an extreme case, though we believe many cases are, if one may say it, extremer still, and more important, because on a larger scale. Here is a church, to begin with, insufficiently lighted, and such windows as there are, are wholly blocked up, or partially obstructed by pews, pulpit, and gallery. All the pews are walled 5 feet 6 inches high, so that even during the standing nothing but the crowns of a few heads are visible; and during the sitting and kneeling, there is nothing whatever to be discovered in the pews: a miscellaneous crowd of women and children are continually suffering or causing annoyance, on benches eastward of the chancel pews, whose lofty walls entirely screen them from observation, excepting only during the communion service: all the "men kind" are in a gallery higher than

the clergyman and the level of the windows, so that, notwithstanding a small garret window in the roof, all their faces are in the shade, and not to be distinguished without a more fixed and scrutinizing gaze than the clergyman's brief opportunities allow. If it is desirable that a clergyman should know who are present, and have it in his mind during the subsequent week, it ought to be made more than possible for him to do this—nay, more than easy; it ought to be made difficult not to see and notice who are present, by bringing forward the whole congregation, so to speak, into the illuminated foreground of the picture, and not leaving any part in the *chiaroscuro* of pews and galleries. We have to provide, not only against dimness of vision and recollection, and bashfulness, but against carelessness and indolence. A church properly seated will allow even a little child to be distinctly visible, wherever placed, and will obviate the necessity of putting the school children either too much out of the way in a corner, or too much in the way, in the passage up the middle aisle.

We are speaking of even ordinary cases, when we complain of churches not being fitted up so as to facilitate the clergyman's survey. There are extreme cases, in which one might suppose it had been considered the very perfection of pewing to hide the whole congregation, as it were, in ambush; in like manner as a perfect fortification presents nothing to the eye but a set of grassy slopes, without any sign of war or even of occupation.

Looking merely to the outside of the affair, to the question of taste, who would imagine that we so much as pretended to be better than our forefathers in this respect! You may enter hundreds of churches, and see a vast quantity of wood work, exquisite in pattern and execution, all parts of one harmonious design,—but now mutilated, half destroyed, hidden, patched, and disfigured with partitions of elm boarding, either prim and vulgar, or so rough and rude, that they would hardly become a decent cow-house, not to speak of a labourer's cottage. Rich and graceful finials have been sawn off; and elaborate foliage chopped away. In some churches it has been discovered, in reboarding the pews, that vast quantities of beautiful wood work from the ancient screen have been converted into sleepers. The stalls of the church have been torn away from the walls, rearranged into squares, and perhaps covered with green baize, or wainscoting. We grieve to add that it is our deliberate conviction, there has been more wanton destruction of such interesting relics within the last generation than at any former age, excepting of course the Reformation and the Rebellion.

We sometimes feel a vast superiority over those nations that occupy unworthily the site of some ancient and classical people.

Thus, we lament over an Arab village built in and upon and out of an Egyptian temple, the Erectheum converted into a Turkish mosque, or the ruins of a Roman temple, which some appear to think almost as bad, re-edified into a Palladian church. With pains we detect and trace out the original work, estimating the modern superstructure solely as it interferes with the first design, and disagrees with its style. We pronounce the age of the first work, classic and civilized; the age of the second, barbaric and rude. Now we may see exactly the same thing in our own churches. To confine ourselves to our present subject—the open seats of the fifteenth century were, many of them, simply as conceptions of taste and works of art, fully equal to anything in Greek or Roman antiquity. The Turk knocks off the capital, burns the pillar for lime, breaks a door-way through the plinth, and builds the walls of his hovel with fragments of foliage, inscriptions, and statuary. By exactly corresponding processes do we convert the open benches of the fifteenth to the close pews of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The successive formations are so many and heterogeneous, that we cannot help commending the subject to the consideration of the geologist, whose terminology will come in very conveniently for the purpose. He will easily recognize his primitive stratum, in the old oak bench; his secondary, tertiary, and other formations, in the various supplementary strata of wainscot or ashen boards; and his still increasing alluvial deposit, in the dull and uniform deal pewing of the modern contractor.

We cannot help fearing that, in spite of the general pretence of improvement, there has been a good deal done of late years to extend and perpetuate the evil. Very great monopolies, very unsightly irregularities, may have been remedied, but perhaps by increasing the evil in a modified form. Half-a-dozen great square pews may have been sacrificed to the public good, and a number of uncouth boxes swept away; but what is the substitute? You may continually find, on entering a church which has been new pewed with great effort and great cost, that two-thirds of the area are covered with uniform deal pews—pews still, with doors still, appropriated still to persons, families, and houses, and that not from year to year, but for indefinite and probably very long periods; the rest of the church being given up to "free seats," that is, benches in the most out-of-the-way, remote, or draughty parts of the church. On Sunday you may see the pews still, as heretofore, exhibiting every variety of occupation and non-occupation, and the free seats not so well occupied as before the new pewing, though perhaps rather increased in number. On the first appearance of things, the only gain is greater uniformity, such as it is, not always of the

most picturesque character. Though the appropriated area be less, still the number of holders is greater; though a good many prescriptive claims to particular sites have been overruled, still perhaps a greater number of private claims of a dangerous sort have been newly established by the appropriation of the new pews, on the mixed ground of previous rights and subscriptions towards the alteration;" and though some have procured "suitable accommodation" who had it not before, perhaps the houseless and landless and pretensionless have been more utterly and uniformly dismissed to a place by themselves, at the lower end of the church.

There is one very wide and very important distinction which we wish to see all persons concerned in church alterations more thoroughly aware of. The Incorporated Society and some of the diocesan societies do seem to recognize it, but perhaps not sufficiently, while other societies seem utterly blind to it. We mean the distinction between increased accommodation of a *permanent* and that of a merely *temporary* character. Actual addition of area, by rebuilding or enlarging a church, is something permanent; it is the natural growth of a church; it is new accommodation without hurting what there now is. Whereas a new gallery, or a mere squeezing up of the old seats and passages a little closer, can only be considered a temporary shift. Suppose the case of a one-aisled church insufficient at present for the population; it is to be made more capacious; the natural and obvious plan is to add another aisle; but a like capacity may perhaps be gained by reducing the passages to 3 ft. 6, shrinking up all the pews to 2 ft. 9, bringing forward the west gallery a few feet, and building a gallery in the existing aisle. Now this latter plan is obviously addition indeed, but with detriment to what there is; it will make all the pews unfavourable for devotion and some quite unusable: and further, there is or ought to be great probability that in a few years the church will be enlarged from the foundations; in which case all the new pewing, gallery, &c. will be destroyed, and the present outlay rendered eventually unprofitable. Suppose, again, a small old church in a large town parish utterly insufficient for the population; it may at a certain expense be made to hold a hundred or two more; but most undoubtedly, if the church prospers in the parish, it will be replaced in a few years by a larger and handsomer structure. Suppose, again, the ancient church of a country town, which may just be made to hold all who now wish to come by carrying a deep gallery nearly all round it, and so converting its interior into the exact type of a meeting-house; which, therefore, the next generation, if it has any good feeling or taste, will certainly not tolerate. In all these

cases the proposed present expenditure must be considered only for a temporary purpose; nay, further, it is worse than being merely temporary, for it has a certain preventive force,—it stands in the way of something more effectual: if £300 is collected with difficulty, and spent on a village church in such a wretched plan of increased accommodation, or £3000 in a town church, it is all the less likely that twice or thrice the sum will be collected within the present generation for some worthier and more permanent plan. Again, even actual enlargements may be considered as permanent or temporary. If a church is indeed enlarged, but so as not to meet the growing wants of the parish, when also there is no likelihood of a second church; if the addition is such that it cannot be added to, but must itself be first taken down, then the enlargement can only be considered temporary. Church building societies ought then, we hold, to consider whether the proposed plan is likely to be permanent, and ought to be permanent: and if on right rules of church building the plan must be considered a mere temporary makeshift, they ought to make their grants accordingly. A man does not give the same sum of money for a short lease that he does for a freehold; nor the same for a lath and plaster hut that he does for a good stone dwelling-house; nor the same for patching and mending his old coat that he does for a new one: he knows he is paying for an inferior article to be used only for a short space of time: and by the same rule we would have a society give only a third or a fourth for an increase gained by a new gallery, or by contracting the passages and such means, of what they would give towards a new church or a good additional aisle, or any such *permanent* increase.

It is to be feared that the rebuilding or repewing of parish churches is too often made an occasion for procuring the recognition and perpetuation of alleged private rights. When money is wanted, too often the rights of the church and of the whole congregation are surrendered. What else is meant by the words one so often encounters in ecclesiastical intelligence—"so many sittings appropriated, and so many free"? Why not all free? And in the present state of things we would allow all to be appropriated under careful conditions. We most earnestly wish that all who are solicited for their subscriptions to such objects, whether societies or individuals, would inquire how far it is a public church and how far a private chapel they are asked for; for if a parish church is to be half, or a quarter, or a tenth part, "appropriated" in the common force of that word, it will be *so far* a private chapel, and ought at least to be rebuilt at private cost, though it ought not, we think, to be rebuilt at all on such con-

ditions. In case of a church being rebuilt, no more private claims ought to be acknowledged but what cannot possibly be got rid of. And more than this, we have no hesitation in saying that there ought to be a power in the Church to revoke all grants of private rights, which manifestly interfere with public good. Such a power is admitted in all civil legislatures, and indeed is absolutely necessary; else private claims would soon utterly choke up and clog the channels and motions of the common weal. Rights and privileges the most ancient and solemn and indubitable, and most repeatedly confirmed, are, on sufficient cause being shown, revoked, if justice requires, with compensation. Witness the emancipation of the slaves, and the disfranchisement of all the smaller boroughs. But what are faculty and prescription pews else than the rotten boroughs of our churches? They are public rights converted into private ones, and maintained for the benefit of individuals at the public loss and expense. Is the English Church alone of human institutions not to be allowed a particle of self-restorative, self-corrective power?

In the golden age of our churches there were no pews, no partitions and private rights, no seats at all. The ground was sacred and therefore common; and therefore all had room without asking, because none grasped, and none had need to grasp. But a new order of things arose, the world and the fashions of the world came in, and then it was otherwise. Till that era, the whole ground of the church was open and common to all:

> "Nec signare quidem aut partiri limite campum
> Fas erat: in medium quærebant: ipsaque tellus
> Omnia liberius nullo poscente ferebat."

In this condition foreign churches still remain; and greatly should we rejoice to see one single English church utterly cleared not only of pews but of seats altogether, excepting perhaps a few here and there, as a special indulgence to the weak and infirm. Why should not the experiment be tried? The supposed necessity of seats is one of the most extraordinary errors of the age. Seats are only used during the lessons and the sermon, which together do not take on the average more than forty minutes, —no considerable addition to the short twenty minutes of standing required by the psalms and hymns. Surely it is no such toil to stand for an hour with occasional rests. The greater part of mankind are on their legs the whole day long, with scarcely any rest,—either in the field, or the workshop, or the manufactory, or behind the desk or the counter. The clergyman himself, who is not generally the strongest man in the parish, stands or kneels the whole service. The posture of standing is urged by physicians on

many who have the alternative, such as students and merchants. A sedentary habit leads to various ill results undoubtedly in the body, and we think also in the mind. To return nearer to our present question, standing is the posture of attention. The muscular strain and the sense of fatigue may seem at first to interfere with the power of attention; but that inconvenience can easily be met by a little force of mind; whereas the ill results of a careless and indolent position cannot be so easily and so certainly overcome. Nay, it is our belief that a little pain and a little interruption serve to quicken the attentive and apprehensive powers, by the very circumstance of their creating a little difficulty, and so giving a zest to the work; for never is a work so likely to be imperfectly done as when there is no impediment whatever in the way of its being done perfectly. The chances of sleep, sleep of all kinds, from downright slumber to mere vacuity and dreaminess, are not nearly so great in standing as in sitting. We should not have churches presenting the discouraging spectacle they so often do, especially on a summer's afternoon, if it were customary to stand during the sermon. So difficult indeed is it to secure against drowsiness under certain circumstances, that we have known persons of different classes make a point of standing throughout the sermon. Standing again is a reverential posture; it is suitable to one who is seeking instruction and blessing; to one who is before a superior, who is receiving a message from above, and who should do so in a spirit of prayer, with faith and obedience. We even require it from scholars before an ordinary master, in any matter of secular learning; we consider it in this case a necessary sign of deference, attention, and obedience. We require the servant to stand before the master, the subject before the sovereign. When Ezra the scribe stood upon the pulpit of wood, and opened the book of the law, "all the people stood up;" and when the Levites in his company caused the people to understand the law, "the people stood in their place." If a posture of devotion is proper when we address God, so also does it seem proper when He addresses us, as He does in the reading of the Scriptures and in the sermon. So strongly has this been felt by many eminent saints of all ages, that they have not been content with merely attempting a "prayerful spirit," but have always read the Bible on their knees, either feeling that such a spirit could not be attained without a suitable posture, or because such a spirit naturally developed itself in bodily prostration. What was felt on this subject in the early Church we may learn from Tertullian, who is expressly censuring some who sat down *after* prayer; not imagining, of course, so great an irreverence as sitting *during* prayer or praise: "Moreover," says he, "the

circumstance of the heathens doing the same thing, *viz.* sitting down immediately after they have worshipped their little idols, makes it reprehensible in us to fall into what appears hence to be an idolatrous usage. It may also be justly charged with irreverence, as the heathens themselves, if they had any sense of propriety, would understand. For, if it is irreverent to sit in the presence and before the very face of any one whom we are bound to reverence and venerate, how much more is it irreligious to do such a thing in the presence of the Living God, while *the angel of prayer* is still standing; unless indeed we reproach God for the fatigue of prayer."*

There certainly does seem an impropriety in sitting in church, except when the posture is significant, as when the bishop sits on his throne, or when it is required by weakness and infirmity. The Church continues to give some testimonies, however few and faint, to this principle. The clergy still stand to receive the charge of their bishop or other ecclesiastical superior. The Church requires every one to bow at the name of Jesus whenever it comes, which seems rightfully to imply standing, as to bow while sitting is an anomaly. It is customary in some churches to rise when the Lord's Prayer comes in the course of the Lessons, though of course it is only read, as it were, historically, as a part of a narrative, which seems to indicate that the whole sacred narrative should be treated with the like reverence. The rubric enjoins standing at the Gospel, and the reason usually alleged is, that in the Gospel we hear the words and acts of our Lord himself, and in the Epistle the words of His apostles. But this distinction is hardly safe or pious to recognize; and the rule which professes to be founded upon it will hardly bear examination. It would evidently require us to stand during the second Lesson, and we think also the first Lesson; for a great part of the Old Testament contains the very acts and words of the Almighty; and as far as the rest might seem not to do so, it would not be proper to leave each private individual to determine when Scripture contained the *ipsissima verba vel acta Dei*, or not. The rubric says not a word about sitting; standing and kneeling being the only postures expressly recognized. It is true there are two or three places where standing is required, and where it is evident the change is not from kneeling, but it is probable that at the time the rubric was framed the greater part did stand or kneel throughout the service, sitting being the exception and an indulgence. Then let it be remembered, that sitting in ancient times, nay, till these three centuries, was a very different thing from what it now is. When the man out of whom

* Tertul. de Orat. c. xii. 134. (Paris, 1664.)

Legion had departed was found sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind; and when Mary sat at Jesus's feet, and heard his word; and when St. Paul learned the law at the feet of Gamaliel, it was on the very ground, a sufficiently submissive situation. In fact, both in our churches and in great houses and palaces, the greater part did once sit on the ground. There were, till about the year 1400, or later, very few seats in either. The clean straw and rushes and branches of trees, we often find mentioned as spread over the floors of domestic apartments, discharged the office not so much of a carpet as of benches, and occasionally of beds. The chairs in foreign churches, by their being out of the way except when wanted, by their being attached to no particular site, and being the property of private persons, are a testimony to the rule of standing, which, whatever may be allowed in the way of indulgence or for the sake of order, we are convinced it is important to keep up enough at least to refer to.

We wish it to be considered, whether the whole notion of a standing audience be not part of another and a better system of preaching and of hearing than what now prevails. It must tend towards submissiveness, and against an easy, supercilious, and critical tone. It supposes hearers in earnest; it seems to sharpen hearing into listening, changing it from a passive to an active process. It seems also calculated to quicken and invigorate the style of the preacher, making it manly and practical, instead of the feeble, discussional, and prosy compositions one too often hears. A preacher is likely to think more of what he says or writes when he realizes a standing congregation. If he has the least sense of decency, he will think it a shame to reiterate and spin out sentences, and prolong "lastly" after "lastly," to no end or purpose, to several hundred men whose legs are aching under them. Their fatigue will check him far more than their sleep. A diluted and iterative style supposes a listless auditory. Dr. Johnson recommended Boswell, when about to plead before a judicial committee of the House of Lords, to say every thing three times over, with a little change of words, on the speculation that every member of the committee would only pay attention to a third of the speech. A compact something like this, we could fancy, exists between modern preachers and hearers; so that, perhaps, if people gave up sitting in churches, the balance of personal comfort might turn out in their favour.

There would be this further incidental advantage in dispensing with seats altogether in church, namely, the great encouragement their absence would afford to kneeling, which would thus become an agreeable rest and intermission. The sitting posture is almost proverbial for continuance beyond just bounds. He who is

sitting, so far forth as he is sitting, is always likely to go on sitting. As it is a state of almost entire rest and self-adjustment, there is nothing in it to stimulate or originate change. It contains none of that κίνησις, or motive power, which is necessary to reproduction or alteration of any kind. Whereas the stander is always intrinsically moved to change. Standing, and that in exactly one position, is rather a continued act than a state, and is easy and ready of discontinuance. Protracted to any great length, it is a difficult and painful discipline, as all who have been schoolboys know, we among the rest. Socrates practised it as such for four-and-twenty hours at a time. There is at least considerably less danger of people standing longer than they ought to do, than of their sitting too long; thus, while itself a posture of devotion, it would stand much less in the way of kneeling.

But it is notorious, and, indeed, is implied in the very terms in which capacity is now expressed and reckoned, that sitting is, in our days, the *staple* position. Indeed, till the present revival of church principles, till these very few years, all new churches, and old churches repewed, were arranged so as hardly to admit of kneeling. Think of congregations of strong, active, supple-jointed Christians, worshipping, or "attending service," reposing on comfortable seats! Yet the indolence and self-indulgence of the age have come to this; and the actual arrangements of the churches recognize it. The pews are so narrow and so high, that it is not possible to kneel really; for there are various degrees of make-believe kneeling, which, if at all different from sitting, are only still more relaxed, and still more apt to lull devotion into dreaminess. We have heard of elderly persons trying to kneel in earnest, in modern narrow pews, and finding themselves in such a straight, that they could not return to their feet without assistance. One lady, who could not reconcile herself to praying except on her knees, on being shown to a pew in a new church, in Manchester, we believe, and finding it admitted only of sitting and standing, requested the beadle to show her to a place where she would have room to kneel. "They don't kneel here, ma'am," was the reply.

We are content at present with having thus stated what appears to us to be the best thing, namely, that there should be no sittings except as an indulgence to those who might claim them as an indulgence; and with having pointed out, that perhaps the balance of conveniences is in favour of this rule. Useless as it would be to urge it generally, it is enough to express a wish, that in the many experiments that are making, the many attractions and seductions that are being held out—the fine singing, powerful organs, comfortable pews, and delightful temperature—some adventurous people would just try the effect of a small chapel in a

populous vicinity, without any congregational fixtures, excepting here and there a seat for the weak and infirm. There are very much wanted some places in the heart of London, near the great *foci* of public business and public amusement, with some service always going on, and whither the religious, whether residents or from the country, may resort, with the certainty of finding a service and some congregation, however small, at any spare half hour that they are released from their engagements. A stranger visiting London once or twice a year for a few days, at the mercy of domestic engagements and hours of business, cannot easily, even with the assistance of the public conveyances, time his appointments so as to hit the hours of Westminster or St. Paul's, or Lincoln's-Inn Chapel, or Margaret Chapel,* or wherever else daily prayer is made. Even if it were possible, the hurry required would be prejudicial to devotion. It would therefore, we are sure, be an unspeakable comfort and benefit, if it could be contrived, to have small chapels of continual service, near the great centres and thoroughfares of London, whither people could retire any minute of the day, and be sure to find a ministering priest, and two or three like-minded. It would, by the way, be an excellent way of introducing kindred spirits, who might otherwise find the metropolis a mere heathen Babylon; and it would throw such as are already acquainted, still more in one another's company. The world has its places of congress and daily muster—its club-houses, its exhibitions of art and science, its exchanges, its parks and promenades;—why should not the Church also? And, above all, whether any other purpose were answered or not, there would at least be a continual offering of praise and thanksgiving and intercession for a busy and a guilty metropolis, which day and night never ceases from sin. Untold might be the benefits of such a practice; unspeakable the strength and support and consolation derived through it to myriads of weak and erring and fainting Christians. But not to dwell longer on this suggestion, it is evident that such chapels would never at any one time be largely attended; there might, therefore, be none of those arrangements of mere convenience, which, however

* We take this opportunity of informing our readers, what we are sure many will be glad to hear, that this chapel is about to be rebuilt on nearly the same site, if not quite, with a view to consecration, which the present building does not enjoy, and of course in a more catholic style and design. We would wish it were in a more central situation, for the purpose mentioned above, but must take things as they come. There can scarcely be any better or more agreeable application of money, after immediately necessary works of piety and charity, than assistance given to this undertaking. Very seldom can one have such a confidence that one's contribution will really *tell* so directly to the illustration and promotion of catholic views. Collections for this object are made in the chapel at four Feasts in the year, when all that has been received in the interval is added to the alms and oblations, and laid upon the Altar.

modest and subdued, cannot but detract from the undivided prominence and honour which ought to be given to the Altar and its adjuncts, besides marring the symmetry and beauty of the interior.

To return to the point of having no seats, except as an indulgence. This we think would be the best; though we are not likely to have it in our time, and perhaps now there would be serious objections in practice. Under these circumstances, some people may think it not wise to suggest the plan. But, in our opinion, that which is really the best ought to be plainly declared, in order that, if a proud, a worldly, or self-indulgent age is not prepared for it, it may at least recognize that fact, and learn to be humble. For this and for many other things we have said, and hope still, God be willing, to say in due time and occasion, we expect to encounter scoffs and even grave rebukes. But by that are we nothing moved, so as we be found not to have hidden our light under a bushel. We repeat, then, that we would rather see, on entering a church, nothing but the altar and its ornaments; the ministering priests and deacons; the pulpit, and whatever else is necessary; the naked floor and the worshippers or hearers thereupon. There is a power and a teaching in that sacred floor, which is lost if it be hidden. It teaches deep humility, unyielding constancy, unwearied patience, changeless perpetuity. The worshipper should throw himself upon it, Πατρὸς ἐπ' οὔδει,* as if it were the floor beneath the footstool of his Heavenly Father, by contact with which he every time derived new strength and succour. There is a virtue, by the same rule that there is a naturalness, in falling down on the very ground,—the very lowest place that can be got at,—when in the act of confession and supplication. Hence it is that galleries are absurd and impossible as places of devotion. They seem contrary to humility. We have heard a clergyman, who in theory had very little respect for ritual and typical religion, say that he really *could not* pray in a gallery. And therefore, if means allowed, that sacred floor, wherein such power is found, ought to be made all bright and beauteous, as all things heavenly are. "And they saw the God of Israel: and there was under His feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in His clearness."† "And before the throne there was a sea of glass, like unto crystal."‡ "And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his work, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God. And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb."§

* Il. E. 734. † Ex. xxiv. 10. ‡ Rev. iv. 6. § Rev. xv. 2.

Openness of area contributes more than anything to the dignity of a building; almost any church, however mean, has a certain beauty when the ground is cleared. How many people who have seen a church just cleared of its old pews, have sighed to think the free expanse should soon be incumbered and hidden again! As the whole area cannot be shown, the next best thing is ample roomy passages. But unhappily roominess is deemed a matter of private importance, as much as of ecclesiastical grace. So there ensues a struggle for ground between passages and pews, the church and individuals, the whole and the few, public and private grandeur, which shall be grandest. The latter has till lately preponderated, and the passage has been reduced to the minimum of mere convenience; nay, so far has the latter sometimes pushed its conquest, or signalized its triumph, as actually to annihilate the centre passage, so essential to the idea of unity and so highly contributing to the honour of the altar, and usurp its place; the centre of the church being filled with pews, and the passages thrust to the sides. In this way, we believe, most of the venerable Scotch cathedrals are fitted up for the performance of Presbyterian worship. We are credibly informed that Kew church has been lately repewed on this dual plan, with the magnificent sum of £3000, given by his late majesty William IV.; while, as if there was a sort of fate in the application of royal gifts, the organ, presented by George IV., which had been his father's favourite instrument, was placed over the altar. This arrangement, bad as it is, is not however so objectionable as another, countenanced, till this year, by the "Suggestions" of the Incorporated Society, viz. making all the passages converge directly towards a central pulpit. The handsome early decorated church of St. Giles, at Reading, while in the hands of a present highly respectable London incumbent, was subjected to this singular treatment. Four or five main passages meet in the pulpit; while, with singular ingenuity, a set of secondary passages under the galleries, converge towards the pulpit, but terminate at the pillars, thus occupying the ground rendered useless by the intervention of the pillars between it and the pulpit. The pews are all of course at right angles to the passages, so that the whole presents a curious specimen of pew crystallization. The lower galleries, for there are two tiers, are arranged in the same order.

If, however, after so grievous a list of complaints, we finish by recommending an almost entire clearance of the floor of the church, we shall seem rather to avoid than comply with the necessity of offering some practical remedy. We should, then, be most happy to compromise, at present, for open benches,

really open, and really benches. By really open, we mean either what our "free sittings" now are, or appropriated only by usage, it being expressly understood, and, if necessary, stated prominently somewhere on the walls of the church, that no *prescriptive* or merely possessory claim would be allowed. However, if necessary, let there be an *annual*, or perhaps triennial, appropriation of the sittings, by the minister and churchwardens, or by commissioners appointed for the purpose by the ordinary, a course which would have some recommendations. We do not, however, think this is really necessary. It is only the vices of persons who cannot be church people at heart, that give it a pretence of necessity. If people are really interested in the services of the Church, they will not care where they are placed, at least they will not be anxious for either comfort or pre-eminence. We could adduce numberless proofs of this; but will content ourselves with the following extract from a letter addressed last year by the Rev. Thomas Hill, Vicar of Chesterfield, to his parishioners, on the occasion of his proposing to replace the pews of his church with open seats; chiefly, if we are not mistaken, at his own expense. The last sentence is conclusive to the point; but we are tempted to begin our extract a little earlier than the occasion strictly requires.

"The general lessons taught by this passage (St. James, ii. 2—5,) seems to be, *first*, the especial concern which God feels, and which He would have us to feel for the poor; and, *secondly*, the duty of laying aside, as far as possible, in public worship, those distinctions of rank which are confessedly necessary at other times. In applying it to the subject of our present inquiry, it becomes me to speak with much diffidence: I would rather leave it to your judgment and conscience, whether, with the opportunity which now offers itself of effecting a change, you will be acting in the spirit of the Apostolic injunction, if you allot to the poor no more than the aisles, and some seats in the outskirts of the church marked as 'Free Seats?' For I admit the force of a remark which was made in opposition to my original proposal, viz., that the poor have a strong objection to such seats. The situation of them is too often unfavourable for seeing and hearing the minister, and they are regarded as badges of pauperism. St. James's admonition will surely lead us to respect such feelings.

"I have already hinted, that pews, however, generally adopted in this country, are a departure from primitive usage. In hundreds of churches old *open* sittings remain: you will find some in the north aisle of our own church; the doors and pannels attached to them you will in a moment perceive to be an accretion of modern date. 'Enclosed pews were not in general use before the middle of the seventeenth century;' they are not to be found in the continental churches, and it is thought by many, that in the course of a few years they will disappear from our

own. Archdeacon Hare enumerates several churches in which the change has been commenced, and adds, 'From various quarters, too, I hear that efforts are making to throw open the pews in old churches; and I trust that ere long it will have been proved in several parishes, how much more favourable the change is to devotional behaviour in church; how it brings home to our hearts that we are all indeed brethren, all members of the same body, that we are all one before God, all one in Christ.' In the re-construction of the parish church of Leeds the whole area is fitted up with open seats; and the effect of this arrangement is thus described in a letter with which I have been favoured from the very eminent minister of that parish; 'I find the rich mingling with the poor, and the poor readily availing themselves of kneelings, which, if marked off as places assigned for paupers, they would not occupy.'

"Will it be thought irrelevant to my purpose, if I refer you to an example, which, if less strictly in point, falls more within the limits of your own observation? In the year 1822, the first of my incumbency, on discovering the lamentable deficiency of accommodation for the poor in our parish church, I submitted to the bishop a plan for fitting up our spacious chancel with *open seats* for their benefit. His lordship's concurrence in the proposal was expressed in a letter, which I have happily preserved, as a memorial of his parental care for the poor of his diocese, evinced in one of the last acts of his life. More than eighteen years have elapsed since the service was commenced: and I may appeal to many witnesses, whether the numerous and well ordered assemblage of worshippers which it has uniformly exhibited does not at once prove how highly a *free* church is valued by the poor; and how groundless would be the apprehension of any intrusiveness on their part, as the result of such an arrangement."

A great deal, we know, will be said about the necessity of preserving distinction of ranks in church, about offering to people of gentility, accustomed to domestic seclusion, a style of accommodation in keeping with their usual habits and ways, about making and preserving in the fitting up of a church the analogy of English society, about inducing the wealthy by all means to come to church, about the superiority of practice over theory, about the English system of squires, about lords of manors, patrons—and large square pews. All this might be well enough, if the "practice" were really in favour of it. But as it happens, the "practice," *i. e.* the practical view of the matter, is entirely on our side of the question, and is most conclusive against all this twaddle, for we will not call it by any better name, however much it may be in the mouths of some very estimable persons. It is the practical view of the question which presents the most intolerable evils, the greatest absurdities, the most crying scandals. We are charged with "theory," by persons who take for granted that all the practical considerations are on their side. It is true

we have a theory, and recognize a theory, and use words with a theoretic relation to another;—but so does every sane man on every earthly subject. The theory we have and speak from is an actual *law* of the Church, and a law of the land,—a matter of common sense and common Christian feeling—it is written on the very walls and floors of our ancient parish churches—it is one of the most universal, prompt and indelible instincts of every English born heart and soul. The theory, which we can produce in every shape, and prove by a hundred million of witnesses from the ancient law book to the village child, is simply this, that every member of the Church has a right to worship in his parish church, so long as room can possibly be made for him. This is our theory. But if we must confess to having a theory, we believe the same may be said of those who take the contrary view of the subject, unless indeed they are people wholly destitute of sense and understanding, and who therefore talk merely at random. They have their theory, and a very vicious, unpractical, and untenable one it is, viz., that it is better, for peace sake, for the comfort of the more substantial and respectable ranks of society, and indirectly for the good of the whole, to maintain the existing state of things, to perpetuate prescriptions of ten years' standing, and make the encroachments of a day eternal legalities, even to the evident discouragement, inconvenience, discomfort, injury, and absolute exclusion from Christian privileges, of a very large and very helpless portion of the community. This is their theory, as much a theory, as fictitious, and we are convinced, as impossible a one as Plato's republic, or Mr. Owen's moral world.

The assumptions of the theory are some of them partly, some of them utterly untrue. For example, it is after all but a small proportion even of rural parishes in which there is some one squire or great man elevated beyond the competition of his fellow parishioners. There are far more frequently several persons of independent property than one. It is, therefore, for a *class* of wealthy persons, and not one, as it were one civil station, that this ecclesiastical distinction is sought. That class then, as a class, as an exclusive body, naturally excites emulation in all that appertains to secular dignity; and is also itself very ill defined, running into the next class of half gentility, merchants and yeomanry, by scarcely descernible transitions. In fact there are in England, even in the rural districts, so many of "the better classes," so closely does each class tread on the heels of its superior, so much is rank left to be asserted by the claimant himself, so widely diffused are general knowledge, and accomplishments, and the outward semblances, the occupations, the dress and furniture of fashionable life, that we may make ourselves quite sure

whatever is generally allowed to one really great man in a parish, will be generally claimed by a dozen or a score would-be great men in half the parishes in the kingdom. The theory therefore of one squire, or one or two squires, as a safe, natural, and satisfactory limitation to the privilege of a large square pew, does not apply to the facts of the case.

To give an illustration of the impossibility of drawing the line. A gentleman rents a mansion of the date of Queen Anne, and together with it a reputed manor, or at least a privilege of shooting. Also, as far as outward manners and education go, he is the first layman in the place. He may be considered the squire. Well, a church, or chapel of ease is to be built, and he demands a distinguished square pew, in accordance with his own rank and station, and with the property he occupies. He is very learned on the subject. His last residence was a cottage ornée; *then* he had not a square pew, and did not expect one: in fact in every previous stage of his career he had sat in a single pew, but always held that the lord of the manor was entitled to a double, *i. e.* a square pew, of superior capacity, and distinguished appearance. All this sounds very well, but unhappily there are in the same parish or district, three or four gentlemen farmers who do not trouble themselves much about their farms, sport hunters, scarlet coats, shoot and course, have pianos in their drawing-rooms, and claret occasionally on their tables, don't know much about other things to be sure, but are quite *au fait* at dogs and horseflesh. To embarrass the matter still more, one of them lives in a mansion, called "the manor house," and has the game on his own land. They are, moreover, by their command over the labourers, the actual rulers of the place, and carry, or rather constitute the vestry. They cannot help feeling a little jealous of the new gentleman above mentioned, especially as they feel he is in some sense a man of the world, which they are not. What can he do, then, with his fine theory of one square pew. Evidently, in his own mind, he excludes the gentlemen farmers. Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω, Εἷς βασιλεὺς, he says in his heart, as he contemplates the presumptuous yeomen, that is, if he has ever read Homer. Yet he can do nothing without their assistance, and they are bent on an equality. Five square pews, or no square pew, is the sad alternative. So he is forced to belie his own beau ideal of perfect order in Church and State, and to say, that he considers certainly such an one and such an one have a fair claim to this distinction. Yet where is it to stop? For it is evident that other considerations than rank enter into the question; and if young Mr. Squander, who scarcely ever enters the church, is to be installed in it with so much honour and ampli-

tude, surely the wealthy and highly respectable miller, with his numerous handsome and intelligent family, is not to be swampt among the rank and file of the rural democracy.

The nice and almost imperceptible graduations of the English social state, of course, greatly favour this spirit of imitation: but once become a part of the national character, no interval whatever, no superiority, however great and confessed, can stand in its way. We could point out a parish in which, and near the church, stands the splendid and ancient residence attached to one of our highest and oldest peerages. The family pews, for there are two, would in any other church be remarkable for the two steps on which they are raised, for their lofty and handsome wainscoting, fringed at the top by the addition of open work or balustrades. However, in this church these fixtures have long ceased to be remarkable. All the pews, to the remotest corner, are almost equally lofty, handsome, and balustraded; and in the aisles and under the east gallery they rise to a much greater elevation than the original type. When the clergyman stands at the altar, before the administration of the Eucharist, and when he pronounces the blessing after it, he cannot see the least sign of one single person present except his clerk, though there may possibly be more than a hundred.

Again, it is an assumption, and a very false assumption, that these "upper rooms" operate favourably on the minds and religion and church attendance of the great and wealthy. To look to the last point, as the most obvious part of the question;—the attendance of the country gentry is often woefully irregular and capricious;—often confined to fine Sunday mornings,—often to the six or eight summer months. The clergyman is told that his church is sadly too cold; "Can you not devise some effectual way of warming the church? Our pew stove is so small, and only draws the damp to us from the rest of the church. Then you are such a way from us, with such a dirty walk, and such awkward stiles. Mr. Dashwood won't have the horses out on Sunday, nor indeed do I quite like to employ them on the Sabbath. Could you not have service in the school-room? We are forced to make it up as well as we can by reading some of Mr. Angel's excellent sermons. Really, health is such an object, and once lost can never be recovered; and Louisa suffered so much from exposure to the cold last year." We could wish that all the non-attendance of the aristocracy were not more blameworthy than the above. Too often it is nursing after a week's hunting or visiting, or mere indolence, or making up arrears of correspondence, or getting through the adjourned debate, or having a quiet morning with

one's visitors, or taking a look over the succession houses, or billiards, or any chance frivolity.

Again, it is part of this theory that the actual system, viz. the system of partitioning the floor of the church out between a comparatively few of the better class, and sending the bulk to holes and corners, in or under the galleries, really answers well as regards the attendance of the people. We take for granted this is part of the theory, for surely if it is, the theory cannot be worth maintaining or refuting. In church, numbers and goodness, not secular rank, must be kept in view. Souls, not good coats, must be essential. The gentleman and the pauper there are equal. Rank, good and useful as it is, yet, by the light of heaven, is undeniably made for the people, not the people for it. If it be for a moment conceded by the advocates of the pew system, that it rather favours and procures the attendance of better classes than of the Christian multitude, then their whole argument falls to the ground. They have betrayed their own cause. But in truth they do not give up this point. They make it part of their theory. They say the dignified and comfortable accommodation of our churches allures those who are accustomed to consideration and ease; and that they, by setting the example, allure the rest. Or again, they allege that the actual system prevents pushing and quarrelling for places and pre-eminence; it tends to order and peace, and *so* procures attendance; i. e. the attendance of those who would be driven away by quarrelling for places. Now this assumption, as part of the pew theory, need only to be stated, to be at once contradicted by the flagrancy of the fact. The multitude have been driven away from our churches, and are being more and more driven away from them. It is equally manifest that the intrusion of the World into the arrangement of our churches, has greatly contributed to this.

There is also quite as much truth in saying, that the rich follow the poor, and should be appealed to through the poor, as in saying that the poor follow the rich, and are to be won by their example. If any one chose to select and dress up his facts, he could make out a good case for the greater truth of the former statement than of the latter. But it is no concern of our's to prove this, or to wish it to be the case. However, as soon as you have mastered the mass of the people, or the majority, you have either gained over the ruling portion, or have at least put them *hors de combat*. The religion of the poor is as contagious as the religion of the rich. Public opinion, though in some niceties it may be only the opinion of the wealthy and educated, is in main points, especially in religious questions, the opinion of the poor. Gentlemen and ladies go to church, and practise other such outward

observances, because they feel their tenants and labourers expect it, and are scandalized at the omission, quite as much as the poor come to church in consequence of the example set them by their betters. Fill your church with the poor, and their betters will be both ashamed and also distressed to stay at home.

The poor look for a home in our churches. They look for a visible fulfilment of the blessing that in Christ all shall be brethren; that unto the poor the Gospel is preached; that with God is no respect of persons, however alien, mean or poor; that the word of God is specially revealed unto babes; that in Christ the brother of low degree is exalted, and the rich made low, because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away; that God hath chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom, which He hath promised to them that love Him. However little they may remember and distinguish the true force of these and a thousand other sacred texts, yet the exalted privilege is indelibly impressed on their minds. They cannot forget it. The Gospel is their means of rising—their field of ambition, if a word so abused and tarnished may be applied to our spiritual aspirations. Forbidden to rise and better themselves any other way, tied to the ground by an invincible necessity, and seeing no other alternative whatever to the extremest end of their earthly pilgrimage, but only labour, and hardest fare, and humblest raiment, and scantiest comforts, and consolations few and fast diminishing,—with this dreary and most inexorably certain prospect before them,—their portion in the Gospel is the only hope and joy on which their minds can find any rest. This is the bright spot in their existence. In this quarter the dark and murky sky that lowers all around them, and threatens perpetual storms of rain and chill, seems to clear and open. Through this opening they discern heaven. By this and towards this they guide their steps. Nor with such revealed hopes, and with an eye that naturally scorns the earth and looks to heaven, will they be content with that degradation and oppression to which the world, the course of the world, would subject them. The world treats them as mere machines, as beasts of burthen, made to drudge for its pleasure, and to be, as it were, a foil to set off its magnificence. But they cannot acquiesce in this, except as a mere injustice, to which the Gospel requires them to submit in patience and cheerfulness, as to any spoiling of goods, or injury of person. They cannot think it right and good. They expect to be something,—they look for consideration. These will be thought suspicious words, and we shall seem to recognize expectations which are no very genuine fruits of the Christian spirit. Confessedly that which we speak of is liable to be spoilt and debased.

It may become the impulse of spiritual rebellion. Still the expectation itself is a sound and holy one. The Christian, whatever his rank, be he poorest and the lowest, cannot help expecting to be loved, considered, respected, and honoured; to receive the sympathies of friendship and brotherhood; to be regarded as one of one household and family; to be treated as really an equal in spite of outward differences,—as equal in the only true abiding sense and form of equality,—equal with a substantial equality, in comparison with which the equalities of earth are the merest figments, dreams, and shadows, and which shall last for ever, when all those earthly equalities and earthly differences shall be as though they had never been.

The poor expect to find this in the Gospel. How should they not? It is implied in the very notion of a heavenly kingdom—it is on the very surface of the New Testament, which we put into their hands, with the liberty of drawing their own conclusions. With this rooted prejudice and popular belief they enter our churches, and find every thing contrary to it. Every thing there belies their most sacred conviction. The sacred floor of the church is partitioned in like manner as the surface of this perishing earth. They see the church, the boasted church, which pretends to be the image and pattern of heaven, in fact the very image and pattern of earth. The surface of the earth, we know too well, is acquired and possessed by the strong and the wealthy; its fairest spots monopolized; walls and fences, and legal terrors, exclude the mass of mankind. Not for the poor, not for innocent childhood, or repentant age, or wearied industry, or pensive sickness, not for the lonely and the disappointed, were they Nature's truest and noblest children, are all the abundant glories of this earth's fair face, the ancient grove, the verdant knoll, and the cool river side. The poor are hemmed in by obstructions, cast away upon corners, drifted into narrow slips, and crowded into the fragments of space. Wherever the rich man plants himself, and surrounds himself with his delights, the poor man is bid to stand afar off, to hide himself, as if he was only a necessary evil. He is stowed away as so much refuse. As far as the merely human world triumphs over nature, all this is the case with the earth. The world has now for a long time been triumphing over the Church, so the same result obtains in it. The poor man sees the ground of the church treated like the ground of the parish. He sees the world, the flesh, and the devil, apparently in full possession. Thus every evil prejudice against the Church is made inveterate. He compares its visible state with his rustic dream of Christian love and primitive purity, and forthwith attaches to the Church every ill quality of pride, secularity, coldness, legality,

form, exclusiveness, and whatever else his condition leads him most to hate and fear.

As we do not wish to overlook in season, so we do not wish to recognize out of season, the unhappy differences which separate us from the Church of Rome; and therefore we do not hesitate to refer to the example of her churches and her congregations for our own improvement. If the several branches of the Church do differ and separate, at least let them provoke one another to good works, that, if possible, some good may come out of evil. The primitive, open and devotional aspect of foreign churches is well known. We have an example of the way in which it strikes an unprejudiced Protestant in Mr. Laing's "Notes of a Traveller," as quoted in the *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1842. But the following quotation from "Men and Manners in America, by the Author of Cyril Thornton," who professes himself to be "no Catholic," is more to our present purpose, and, with drawbacks which we need not particularize, is a very striking passage.

"Both Catholic and Protestant agree in the tenet, that all men are equal in the sight of God, but the former alone gives practical exemplification of his creed. In a Catholic church the prince and the peasant, the slave and his master, kneel before the same altar, in temporary oblivion of all worldly distinctions. They come there but in one character, that of sinners; and no rank is felt or acknowledged but that connected with the offices of religion. Within these sacred precincts the vanity of the rich man receives no incense; the proud are not flattered, the humble are not abashed. The stamp of degradation is obliterated from the forehead of the slave, when he beholds himself admitted to community of worship with the highest and noblest in the land.

"But in Protestant churches a different rule prevails. People of colour are either excluded altogether, or are mewed up in some remote corner, separated by barriers from the body of the church. It is impossible to forget their degraded condition even for a moment. It is brought home to their feelings in a thousand ways. No white Protestant would kneel at the same altar with a black one. He asserts his superiority every where, and the very hue of his religion is affected by the colour of his skin.

"From the hands of the Catholic priest the poor slave receives all the consolations of religion. He is visited in sickness, and consoled in affliction; his dying lips receive the consecrated wafer; and in the very death-agony, the last voice that meets his ear is that of his priest uttering the sublime words, 'Depart, Christian soul.' Can it be wondered, therefore, that the slaves in Louisiana are all Catholics; that while the congregation of the Protestant church consists of a few ladies, arranged in well-cushioned pews, the whole floor of the extensive cathedral should be crowded with worshippers of all colours and classes?

"From all I could learn, the zeal of the Catholic priests is highly exemplary. They never forget that the most degraded of human forms

is animated by a soul as precious in the eyes of religion as that of the sovereign Pontiff. The arms of the Church are never closed against the meanest outcast of society. Divesting themselves of all pride of caste, they mingle with the slaves, and certainly understand their character far better than any other body of religious teachers. I am not a Catholic, but I cannot suffer prejudice of any sort to prevent my doing justice to a body of Christian ministers, whose zeal can be animated by no hope of worldly reward, and whose humble lives are passed in diffusing the influence of divine truth, and communicating to the meanest and most despised of mankind the blessed comforts of religion. These men publish no periodical enumeration of their converts. The amount and the success of their silent labours is not illustrated in the blazon of missionary societies, nor are they rhetorically set forth in the annual speeches of Lord Roden or Lord Bexley; and yet we may surely assert, that not the least of these labours is forgotten. Their record is where their reward will be."—vol. ii. pp. 209—212.

It is a general truth we should wish to see carried out much farther and much more consistently than now is, that no outlay of money can righteously purchase any right in a church and no possession of property can rightly deserve it. Sacred things are perfectly incommunicable for money, for they are incommensurate with it. Property in pews, supposed ever so indirectly to be an equivalent for money, is of the essence of simony. The right of so much as entering a church, and being in any part of it whatever, much more a right to occupy any particular part, cannot without sin be bought and sold, or considered an equivalent for any expenditure of money. It is like purchasing, or pretending to purchase, a right to heaven. Viewing a church simply as a sacred place, and putting out of view its human aspect, *i. e.* its congregational purposes, it is shocking to think of its holy ground being sold for money, or treated as a house or field.

But if we take its congregational purposes into account, the offence, and indeed the absurdity, of this proceeding, are all the more flagrant. Let us suppose the extreme case of a man founding and endowing a parish church; that is, a church which, according to the Catholic system, is to be *the* church, *the* one temple for those within a certain ecclesiastical district, having an absolute claim on their attendance, being *the* one fountain of heavenly blessings, *the* one place which God hath chosen out of all the tribes to place his name there. If the building is to be this, and all that is implied in a parish church, once consecrated, it is no longer a thing of this world,—it is no longer a creation of man,—and it is no longer a voluntary affair. In two respects, of infinite import, does it differ from any mere earthly institution. First, it is a Divine reality; secondly, it is the object of the most awful and obliging religious regards. The condescensions of

heaven, and the aspirations of men, meet and conspire to make it what it is. God gives it holiness and efficacy: man gives it reverence and submission. So then looking only to what man contributes to the building, the gift of the founder, after he has done every thing that money can do, is the least part of the foundation. The Church, *i. e.* the visible society of Christians, gives reverence and faith, and every sanction and feeling that can ratify and realize the design. The gift of brick and mortar and maintenance for the minister, is an infinitely less important thing than what the humblest Christian gives when he takes off his hat on entering the church, kneels down on its pavement, draws near to the altar, and opens his ear to the words of the preacher. What the founder gives cannot, without an apparent irreverence, be mentioned in the same sentence with what the Church gives. His sacrifice cannot for a moment be measured with her obedience. As far as regards the noblest parts of the material, nay, the only parts to be mentioned in a sacred reference, the *Church* is the founder. The Church has allowed one of her children the honour of rearing, with earth's gross materials, a fabric after the pattern of a house of God. Till the Church comes in, it remains only a heap of stones, a lifeless perishable mass. She, by the name of Him who dwells in her, gives it life and power, making it what it only before aspired to be.

The Church thenceforth proceeds to treat this structure as a gift of God rather than a creation of man. She commands her children to resort to it, at the risk of their salvation; she maintains it with a liberality which she encourages to profuseness, and does not hesitate to demand even by force; she declares it to be inviolable, to be for ever maintained, and reluctantly yields to the greatest human necessity so far as to allow the sacred walls to be destroyed, the sacred ground to be made common; she declares her whole visible establishment of fabrics and maintenance to be worth any risk, to call for the most boundless political sacrifices from the State, to be cherished with an infinitude of zeal, and to be preferred before any other visible institution whatever, before the institutions of commerce and policy, before the nobility and royalty itself. The parish church she makes the greatest and the boldest, and to alien hearts the most odious, monopoly in the land; she maintains this monopoly at the expense of every convenience and comfort, and even at the expense of many important considerations of real usefulness. She forbids her children to go after more moving and more edifying teachers, or to worship nearer home; she even allows difficulties in the way of the most needful increase of her habitations; she grudges to give the blessing of God through her to more than one sacred spot in each parish, and reserves those blessings in all their fulness

for one ecclesiastical unity. Innumerable are the sacrifices of natural and political freedom which she demands from the State in maintenance of this monopoly; such demands as nothing but the most undoubted heavenly sanction could justify. The when, and the where, and the how to worship, she dictates without scruple or qualification. She exercises, what, but for her all-sacred sanctions, would be a most unbearable tyranny over the minds of men. Besides that the mere occupation of the ground, the mere existence and dead weight of her system, is itself of the nature of monopoly, she does not tolerate any other system, nay, in a thousand ways she persecutes and oppresses all. Much there is that men might and do choose, with great show of reason, instead of religion; many modes of religion instead of the Gospel; many semblances of the Gospel instead of the Church; and many developments of the Catholic Church instead of the Church of England; but the Church of England, in the plenitude of her authority, or the boldness of her presumption, denounces and crushes them all. Every school of opinion, every sect of religion, however successful, feels and acknowledges her crushing overpowering influence. A hundred rivals find themselves overshadowed, withered, drained of their strength, and stunted in their growth, by one vast monopoly. On the altar of the English parish church are offered up the wealth, the power, the freedom, the happiness, the civil unity and equality of the land. There exists not under the sun a sterner and more costly monopoly.

Now all this, and more than we can express, may be considered the price which England pays for the parish church. How can we put in comparison with it any sum of money spent in the building or maintenance of the structure? That is the very least part of the expense. It is utterly insignificant. The very smallest right in the church is a compensation utterly beyond all proportion to it.

It is then most absurd and indecent that even the builder and endower of a church should claim, or be allowed as a legal right, any pre-eminence, or any particular place or quantity of ground within the sacred edifice. As long as it remained unconsecrated, it was the founder's own, and in his own power: once given to God, he had no right whatever in it—no right to make any reserve, and stipulate that it should be partly his own and partly the Church's. He gave one thing, and the Church, as the authorized representative of the Deity, gave another. To some extent it might be considered a joint result: and if his contribution had been in the smallest degree comparable or commensurate with the Church's, then might he claim perhaps a certain property, and peculiar enjoyment of the result. But this, as we have seen, is not the

case. It is sheer worldliness and impiety for the founder himself to stipulate for any conditions. He wished his church to be a church; why should he also require it to be a private commodity? When he had done his best, and may be given all that he had, and sorely pinched himself and his to give it, he was but an unprofitable servant, and had reason to be thankful for the very lowest place, for leave only to eat of the crumbs which fell from his Master's table. He was amply rewarded, if he might be but doorkeeper to the temple he had built.

If it be so in the extreme case of the founder and endower himself, much more is it in all cases of lesser benefit to the Church, which is the very highest ground on which pews are commonly claimed. We put other grounds out of the question just now, because we are considering the appeal to the feelings of gratitude and equity which is often made in favour of pew property. It is proved or presumed, that the present proprietor, or some one whom he represents, was a special benefactor to the Church, or to the parish, or, from his station and good qualities, a person to be treated with lasting regard, and that therefore he at least should be allowed to retain his pew. And the advocates of the system generally, having proved to their satisfaction that one private pew is allowable, proceed to lay down, that, for anything we have said to the contrary, it is allowable and proper to parcel out half the area of the church among the families of the better sort. But whatever we have said of founders applies so much the more to benefactors, great and little, actual or presumed, direct or indirect;—to the univeral generation, and the whole kit and kin of patrons, friends, supporters, partizans, lords and ladies bountiful, improvers, beautifiers, restorers, reformers, and every thing else that ever ventured to touch and help the Church in her necessity and danger. Do what they will, they can no more put the Church under the smallest obligation to them personally, and to their heirs after them, than they can the sun, moon and stars. As to any consequent pre-eminence of place in the church, their language should be that of old Barzillai, "Thy servant will go a little way over Jordan with the king; and why should the king recompense it me with such a reward?" Service done to the Church entails no obligation whatever, except on him who, to his own great blessedness, has been graciously enabled and allowed and disposed to render it.

It is possible that some of these considerations may appear rather transcendental to those who consider that the common business of the world is the best pattern to go by in administering heavenly things. Let us attempt then to take a business-like view of the subject. Suppose a century since or more, the lead-

ing man, the most influential and most public spirited, and most useful and most liberal person in his parish; let him have served parochial offices, furthered public improvements, revived trade, originated subscriptions, founded charities, reconciled factions, and done all or more than the times allowed to be done or imagined; let him be wholly unrewarded, and let his services be really above ordinary rewards; let him also be a special benefactor to the Church, a builder of an organ loft, the presenter of a gilt chandelier or costly Corinthian altar screen; when thus recommended to the respect and gratitude of all, let him build a stately mansion in the parish, surround it with gardens and grounds, and present all the appearance of founding a principal family, and permanently establishing it in the parish. Let it then occur to his friends that it would be a very suitable compliment and return for his services, specially for those done to the church, to secure for him and his newly-built house the spacious pew which his goodly family was at the time so gracefully occupying. They draw up a petition, setting forth the above considerations, obtain the unanimous concurrence of the vestry, and have no difficulty in procuring a faculty attaching the pew to the said mansion house for ever. Now we do not expect that any cases of faculty or prescriptive pews are so strong as this. In general they would hardly admit of grave and dignified description. But even in this instance we do not hesitate to maintain that the gift was preposterously unjust and absurd. In the first place, the gift of the parish was, on a right view of things, perfectly unnecessary. Our supposed benefactor had already as much as he wanted; and the future occupiers of his house were entitled by law, and were humanly certain, to be amply and suitably accommodated. It was not, therefore, mere ample and suitable accommodation which the grateful parish were giving him, but a certain peculiar and adventitious right, a certain most iniquitous privilegium, viz. the monopoly of so much room for ever, whether it was really wanted or not — a right, if right it could be called, to an equal quantity of space for ever, even if his representatives should decrease ever so much, and the rest of the congregation increase ever so much — even if his family and successors should diminish to unity, and the parish should become ten times as numerous, and as poor. The pew, being a given quantity of the church floor, say a fortieth or thirtieth, might be said to carry with it a fortieth or a thirtieth of all the expense and sacrifice, according to our above estimate, which the parish, the Church, and the nation had contributed to that church. It cost a fortieth or a thirtieth of the original expense of the church, and all the maintenance of the structure and of divine service from that day to this: it cost the like proportion

of the vicar's income, the lecturer's stipend, and every other salary, whether subscribed or paid out of the church-rates. Further, it and one or two more similar clippings and curtailments of the common stock, rendered the west gallery necessary, the expense, inconvenience, and desightment of which must be added to the cost of those two or three pews. The subsequent addition of two side galleries, and perhaps one over the chancel, contribute to swell the amount. To the sum must be added a quota of every expense which the parish has since gone to on every ecclesiastical account whatever, such as building two or three chapels of ease. But by far the greatest and most costly item remains to be added. That pew led to others of a similar ambitious and exclusive character: they were not perhaps faculty pews, simply because it was found, a pattern being once exhibited in the Church, the thing might be done more quietly and less expensively: but they were equally appropriated to houses and families, to continue their's from age to age, whether occupied fully, scantily, or not at all. It cost, therefore, the cost of its example: and inasmuch as the actual exclusion of the poor, the exclusive and private air given to the church, the decrease or non-proportionate increase of a congregation interested in the Church, all were the chief causes and furtherances of dissent; we shall not attain to the total cost of that ill-fated gift, unless there is thrown into it a large proportion of all the misspent money, zeal, and devotion, which, being shut out of the Church, has developed into a dozen varieties of heresy and schism, now enshrined in a dozen spacious tabernacles of enduring brick and mortar.

It is, indeed, quite impossible to estimate the public expense incurred by every private pew. Two or three of our pages would not suffice for a list of the separate items, that is, of such as could be assessed at any conjectural sum of money, or defined by any nicety of language, and there would still remain items which no figures or even words could reach. We do not hesitate to say, that if ten persons came forward in one of our overgrown manufacturing towns, and offered to build ten chapels of ease, or ten district churches, in consideration of having ten pews in the mother church, appropriated for ever to their families or mansions, we should think it a point not only of principle, but of the most common expediency to decline the proposal.

To come down to a very practical consideration, how can we reconcile church-rates with the present system of pews? Viewed by the side of the latter, the former are convicted of the most flagrant extortion—a tax on the community at large for the comfort and display of a few. On the other hand, admitting the propriety of church-rates, pews cannot escape the conclusion of

being palpable encroachments. The whole question of church-rates we gladly refer to other hands, or at least to a more auspicious occasion; but as they hinge directly on the question of Church and State, it is evident that we cannot with safety overlook an abuse which gives them at least the colour of injustice. In fact, even the English churchman, who glories in anomalies, and, secure in the intrinsic excellence of his cause, is rather apt to defy the argument of appearances, must admit the urgent necessity of *adjusting* those two discordant parts of the existing system, church-rates and pews. How do the facts of the case present themselves to an external observer, or to any one who does not enjoy that peculiar experimental benefit from the system, which produces the impression of its "working well?" Go into an ordinary town parish. The church-rates are considered by a good proportion of the people an odious and tyrannical impost, only endured as long as there seems no chance of successfully resisting them; they are wholly given up in some large towns; and maintained in many others only by the very unecclesiastical and very unpopular provision which allows votes in proportion to the amount of rates. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, in the parish who have been nurtured in the belief that the Church is one great erroneous, sinful, and pernicious usurpation. Strangers to its courts for years or for their lives, they are yet called on to contribute their quotas to its maintenance. The church-rate is vexatious to the wealthy heathen or dissenter, and absolutely oppressive to the poor; nor are the persuasions and arguments on which it is urged always of the truest or most satisfactory character. The malcontent is reminded that in the Gospel taxes were to be paid even to a Pagan persecutor;—an illustration as little consolatory to the dissenter as it is flattering to the Church; he is further told that the State must choose and maintain one religion;—a necessity by no means obvious to one who is subscribing annually twenty times his church-rate towards the establishment of the contrary principle: all are told, especially the poor, that the "burden" is on the property, and the occupier does not really pay it, as he took the land subject and so forth; this averment is contradicted by the very act of demand, which is made on the actual occupier; nor again is it pleasant to be told that a payment formally religious is really involuntary, and that the church-rate, so far from being heart service is neither eye service, hand service, nor body service at all, but merely house and land service: something is then said about the smallness of the rate; but the smallest payment is heavily felt when it is believed to be unjust, and as a practical question, eighteen pence forcibly exacted

for what is thought to be no equivalent, or worse than no equivalent, is felt at the time very seriously by a family which earns not more than eighteen-pence a head weekly, and many there are such, though the clamorous "church-rate martyr" may not happen to be in the class; but the crowning argument is, that the Church of England is emphatically the church of the poor, that it demands no poll-tax nor subscription, nor pew rent, nor other *personal* contribution, and opens its doors to all without distinction of persons, sending its ministers to all invited or uninvited. The Church may perhaps open its doors to all, but how does it fulfil its boast of being the Church of the poor? Let us see.

The poor man having paid out of his earnings towards the expenses of public worship, and the maintenance of a costly fabric, diffidently approaches its portals. Within he finds a great deal of apparatus and ornament just of that decent and comfortable sort which seems rather addressed to the tastes of private life and genteel society, than to the severer and more reverential instincts of religion; and which, therefore, though not so calculated to provoke the keen hatred of the fanatic, are possibly the more likely to awaken the bitter envy of the poor. The whole plan seems designed for gentlemen and ladies, or at least for such as the world has smiled upon. There is mahogany pannelling and brass rods, and crimson curtains, a silken clergyman, and perhaps a tasselled clerk, new gilding and painting, and varnish, matting and carpeting, most roomy and comfortable pews, fitted up with as much variety of colour and device as the parlours and drawing-rooms of the owners, two or three large stoves, partitions of wood and glass and baise, and scattered about the pews, with plenty of room to dispose their limbs and the more flowing portions of their apparel, a number of very contented looking gentlemen and ladies, with here and there a family of children, neither half clad nor half starved, as is possibly the case with the supposed observer's own. Wherever he turns, wealth and ease and finery stare him in the face. Whatever is bright, obvious, and symmetrical in the arrangement and equipments of the building,—whatever basks in the broad light of the Church,—belongs to the aristocracy, or would-be aristocracy, of the parish. But the poor, where are they? Nowhere. Stay;—here is a Sunday school in the middle aisle; and in a remote corner are two or three dozen "free sittings," as also in the middle aisle, where they look as homeless and comfortless and wind-blown as so many apple stalls lining the pavement of the High Street; and on these are half a dozen old men and women. Here and there in holes and corners may at length be discovered a few more. The Church seems a mere epitome of the

town; in which the great thoroughfares and openings, the stately mansions and terraces, are occupied by those on the summit or ascendant of wealth and power; while the ten thousand poor are buried out of sight in lanes and allies, in cellars and garrets, in lonely cells or crowded lodging houses. Is it possible that this is the Church of the poor? the poor man does not fail to ask. Is it reason or justice, or anything but mere tyranny,—the dead weight of an inveterate wrong,—that this wealthy, luxurious, exclusive, congregation should levy tribute from us poor people, whom it spurns and virtually drives away? In this way and on these grounds the poor actually do argue against the claims to supremacy and national support advanced by the Church; and in this way they will argue till the apparent grounds are altered, and the Church shall be, and seem to be, as well as pretend to be, the Church of the poor.

But what a school of graces, what a healing and consoling spectacle would true Church equality present to this restless, striving, emulous world! Men cannot help dreaming of equality and seeking it somewhere. They are possessed with the idea, as they are indeed with many other seemingly impossible and even contradictory ideas, such as an absolutely virtuous authority, purity, an impartial rule, a universal love, and other—as some deem them—Utopian theories. These are all deeply implanted in the human mind; they are its natural instincts and just tendencies, co-ordinate and harmonious in their origin and right development, and only conflicting in their waste and abuse. A world indeed of tyrants and slaves would this world most speedily become, if a certain vision of equality did not continually hover before the eyes of men; light to some, darkness to others; encouraging those to the cheerful renunciation of earthly distinctions; misleading these to restless repining and hopeless discontent. The Church is the only sphere and form in which these instincts can rightly grow and mature; she presents a spiritual equality which infinitely transcends every system which man has imagined or attempted, and which effectually secures her genuine sons from joining the vulgar throng of ambitious aspirants or envious levellers; she is the only true democracy, the only popular representation; she alone gives social consideration to the units of the multitude; she alone gives dignity to weakness, and humility to power; her law is no arbitrary system of partial enactments, but is written in the hearts of all for the good of all; the voice of her people is the voice of God, and her one object is identical with their highest welfare; she alone has preserved through every age and clime her unanimous council, her assembly of one mind and one accord; she alone admits an appeal to the principle of an

unreserved community in every thing really needful to the life and happiness of man; she exalts the slave into a brother, and reduces the master to the service of One who himself took upon him the form of a servant, and was amongst us as he that serveth.

But besides this instinct of equality, not to be overlooked and left to take its own course without the most certain ill results, there is another additional danger in our case. The existence of the Church amongst us—a remedy for that danger, if properly welcomed and obeyed—becomes an aggravation of it, if neglected or ill administered. Whatever God has given us, whether in nature or grace, whether to the outward or the inner world, becomes a condition which must be taken into account. We cannot with impunity reject it, or stifle it, or close our eyes to it. If we attempt to do so, it will force itself upon our notice when we least wish it, and in a form that will surpass even our first imaginations of its danger. Though for a time we exclude the dreaded intruder from our thoughts and arrangements, and surround ourselves with customs and institutions of the safer and more convenient, and, as we may think, more human and practical character, yet the divinity both of nature and of grace will soon break out, triumph terribly over our petty obstructions, and avenge itself on its short-sighted and presumptuous rejectors—

> Οὗτοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα,
> Ὅσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἑκὼν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἕλοιτο.

When we see a system which apparently disregards the voice of heaven and the natural feelings of man, because it fears they may be followed to a dangerous and uncontrollable excess, we confess we see its doom not very far off. In its safety it will perish. Its ancient invulnerable walls and defences shall be visited by hunger and thirst and feebleness and paucity within, and an ever increasing multitude of irreconcilable foes without. Its own walls shall fall upon its defenders, its own towers shall be the grave of its thousands; and that because it was found even to fight against God. It is said of fire, the most sacred and mysterious of elemental appearances, that it is a good servant, but a bad master. It might be much more truly and awfully said of the instincts of nature and the economies of grace, especially of those we are referring to. The Church, in whatever shape, through whatever medium, *exists* amongs us; the Gospel, understood or not, is preached; the Bible is read. On the very surface of these appears a promise and pretence of equality. Wherever they are, there will always be found floating in the minds of men the notion of a certain spiritual democracy; there always will be a prevalent opinion of divine sanctions for the purely popular, really repre-

sentative, impartially elective, and perfectly congregational theory of government. Some writers have indeed gone so far as to say that modern liberty, whether developed in a republic or in a constitutional monarchy, is an offspring of the Church, which, directly or indirectly, they say, has enfranchised mankind. However this may be, the mere neighbourhood of the Church, its mere presence in the visible order of things, renders the democratic tendencies of human nature a hundred times more dangerous. It is in some sense a democracy; a people without a visible king; a combination and a power, without arms, independent of money and rank and prescription and hereditary right; dispensing its privileges freely to all, and recognizing a sacredness and a sovereignty in every member of the system. It seems then a standing witness for certain so-called natural rights of man. It teaches an equality, and it is far too conspicuous for its teaching not to be heard down to the very depths of society. That teaching will be either understood or misunderstood; it will be made to tally either with truth or error. Now we confess we do not think the Anglican "Establishment" does faithfully and freely represent the democratical aspect of the Church: the very appearance of our churches, which is the point we are now concerned with, indicates the usurped supremacy of money and rank and power: it has confessedly a tyrannical and oligarchical air. There is little to remind us of the "hundred and twenty *names*," the "three thousand *souls*," and "the *multitude* of them that believed," but much to remind one of houses and lands. What then is the result—for we do not hesitate to call it the result—of this unfaithful teaching?

A fearful religion is springing up and already is rife in our large towns and populous districts; a religion to make statesmen and churchmen tremble. It is not solicitous about articles of faith and cares not for spiritual things; but from every creed and shadow of a creed it borrows that which seems to favour license and equality. This single testimony, this one promise does it discover in every system of religion; and by this one test does it convince every system of not fulfilling what it promises; an inconsistency which it declares to be fatal to the authority of Churches and creeds, though it does not refuse to accept their teaching in this one thing. It takes the gift and rejects the giver; or, as it imagines, separates the wheat from the chaff, the kernel from the husk. And this one truth, that is to harmonize all confessions, and to show all the religions under the sun to have been at the same time right and wrong, is universal equality,—the extrication of natural rights from the entanglements of ages. This dogma is now being sanctified and arrayed with the precious spoils of

every creed; sacred text and holy rite, apostle, saint, and council, catholic and protestant, things that have been and things that are, are all compelled to recommend and adorn it. It is come to that pass that thousands believe the Chartist and the Socialist to preach the Gospel; and these names do not express a hundredth part of the depth and spread of the heresy. Now the Church is the antagonist system to this delusion, whose votaries do by a sort of instinct single out the Church from the multitude of religious professions, as bearing some resemblance to the shadow they are pursuing. Nor will anything but an exhibition of the Church with some measure of her primitive graces and charities, with something of her all receiving, all embracing tenderness, be able to arrest this plague.

There is another view of the Church of England which it is painful and shocking to think should ever have been entertained for a moment by any one professing communion and sympathy with her; but which really, though most unhappily, is in keeping with the actual appearance of our churches. The view, we mean, that "the Church" in England is a suitable creed and form of worship for the higher and middle classes, while the "meeting-house" is equally adapted for the poor. This view of course supposes religion to be a matter of adaptation; to be merely an expression of feeling,—and of feeling as modified by circumstances and states of life; to be best when freest; and most natural and perfect when left most to spontaneous impulse and fortuitous utterance. The holders of it are bound to consider the Church the least respectable, because the least genuine and unsophisticated of the religions of the day; and probably do so consider it, being only prevented by regard for their worldly interests or by false shame from attaching themselves to the community worshipping in the nearest conventicle.

Now the mere fact of such a view being not only entertained by sensible people, but being rather a favourite one, and a ready solution to many minds of the pains and perplexities of schism, is of itself a phenomenon deserving attention, as proving that the Church of England does not generally seem what it really is, and that its true claims are not generally known. In what other Church, professing to be catholic, could such a view so much as occur to any mind, however innovating or fantastical? Who, for example, would ever have thought of saying that the Church of Rome, as exhibited in Rome, was more suited to the poor than to the rich, or to the rich than to the poor, or to the ignorant than to the educated, or to the clever than to the simple, or so on through every assignable classification of humanity? For the Church of England alone, of catholic churches, is reserved the

shame of such an imputation as that she should not be adapted for the poor of Christ,—the poor to whom the Gospel is preached. With regard to the view itself we can scarcely muster patience to observe first, that there is not one intimation in the whole Bible of a religion for the rich and a religion for the poor; on the contrary that one only religion was ever admitted to be true; secondly, that one great object of the Mosaic and Christian institutes was to direct and purify the relations of the rich and the poor, and make them one in Christ; then, that these very differences of rank and knowledge are, in fact, a divine economy designed to advance unity of spirit by means of diversity of operations; lastly, that from the beginning to the end of the Bible are to be found perpetual denunciations of every system calculated to separate the rich and the poor, and dissolve their mutual religious responsibility. We cannot conceive a heavier sentence on the Church of England than that she should be pronounced fitter and more congenial with the comfortable and rational, and well informed classes, than with the poor and needy, the simple and unlearned.

On a very slight consideration it is evident, that that is not the best religion for any class which it will choose or make for itself when left entirely to itself. Religion is meant to harmonize and discipline all the tendencies of the heart and mind to a one given divine rule; it cannot therefore be improved by allowing those tendencies to develope differently according to circumstances, and, itself following where it should lead, taking its character and very name from that which it ought to subdue. The rich are liable to one set of spiritual errors, the poor to another; the learned and the ignorant have their respective temptations: the only pious sense in which the terms a religion for the rich and a religion for the poor could be employed would be to denote, on the one hand, a style of discipline pre-eminently calculated to check the vices of wealth, to mortify fulness of body, pride of intellect, wantonness of power, haughtiness of rank, the grasping hand, and the greedy eye; and, on the other hand, a teaching that alleviated present wants, by the consolations of the future, that instilled resignation, obedience, and self-control, and extinguished murmurings and disputings, by setting forth the excellence of Christian poverty. In this sense of the term we cannot believe that our Church is not *really* calculated for the poor, any more than we can allow that characteristic to the religion of the meeting-house. Vulgar untaught fanaticism does not supply any real deficiency of the Church; it does not meet but follow the peculiar ill tendencies of the class it appeals to. It unwittingly imitates what it falsely imagines of the Church, and appropriates the sins it thinks to denounce. It

makes the poor ambitious, discontented, confident, set on earthly things, leaning on their own wisdom and subtlety; and so cannot be called the religion for the poor.

It must never be lost sight of, that the Church is the only true place and way of giving dignity and elevation and freedom to the poor. The Church is their palace, their most congenial parliament, their most impartial court of justice. Its laws are their only abiding charter of freedom and privilege. The humiliation and weakness of the Church have always led to the degradation, oppression and slavery of the poor. When has the Church been at such a low ebb in England as during the last century and a half? and when have the poorer and weaker classes suffered such an accumulation of insult and robbery? To mention a few particulars. The Universities were once open to the poor, nay, contained, and do contain immense endowments expressly intended for poor scholars; they maintained, and taught, and raised to the highest places in the Church thousands of penniless students: the Universities now practically exclude the poor. There once were and are now hundreds of schools, founded for the sons of the small tradesman, the farmer, the artizan, and even the labourer, and designed to teach them the universal languages, as the vehicles of grammar and science, and enable them to rise, if not in condition, at least in mental attainments: it may be said generally of these, that in one way or another they have been plundered, disabled, closed to the poor, or wholly destroyed by the wealthier classes; where they exist, the poor are generally admitted only as strangers, or on sufference, into *their own*. The poor have been deprived of their commons, their right of pasturage, their small holdings, their little estates, all of which have been sacrificed to the convenience of the wealthier classes, and to the theory of population, wealth and production. How far the necessities of the nation required it, we do not stay to inquire; we only say that the poor have been the sufferers. They have been deprived of their little independence, their little opportunities of bettering themselves. The class just above the labourer has been almost destroyed, and with it innumerable facilities for carrying on the work of social improvement have disappeared. The poor have been deprived of their games, their amusements, and their mirth. An inventive age has multiplied to excess the toys and recreations of the wealthy, till they seem the business of life; while the poor are not to be won and beguiled from sensual indulgence, and are only to be preached and terrified, with tracts and treadmills, sermons and six months' imprisonment, into an austere, a servile morality, out of which the wealthy have done their best to draw the last smack of relish or sweetness.

Their daily bread, also, has been made the sport of varying theories and state exigencies, that equally put out of sight natural justice, Christian principle, and the peculiar sacredness of the labouring and suffering classes of mankind: it has been lavished or denied merely as population was to be increased or diminished. The thousands of ancient foundations by which age and poverty were once maintained, not as a burden on the land, but as the army of the Church—not in base inutility, nor in the cheerless and prayerless walls of the prison—but in the courts of the Lord's House, and in a state and occupation which transcend the dignity and the awful function of sceptered kings; nay, the greater part of the alms-houses and charitable foundations which these later days had permitted them, have been rendered useless to the poor, perhaps absorbed by the landowner, and, at any rate, generally deprived of their religious character. Not to dwell any longer on that most fertile and most momentous subject, which we would give much to see taken up by an abler and more persuasive pen than ours, "The Wrongs of the English Poor," we will revert to the truth which led to this imperfect enumeration. No mere human legislation will ever give the poor their rights; their just treatment is an act of faith, as well as an office of reason: the Church alone has the grace and authority to do it; before her altar, nay, from her altar, this work must begin. If it be there neglected—if, in the very presence of Him who is the Patron of the afflicted and helpless, the poor are not to be found, or are found treated with indignity and injustice, then the very fountain-head of charity is stopped, or rather poisoned. The whole stream downwards will be minished or polluted, for whence is supply and purification to arise? If the Church do not herself at her own altar give dignity and consideration to the poor, the world assuredly will not; nothing will avail for them: the most magnificent endowments will be perverted or destroyed; the most equal and even levelling laws will be ridden through by what no laws can prevent or remedy, the ascendency and the insolence of wealth, and of combinations for selfish or party purposes. Laws avail nothing without a right religious tone, and this tone it is the office of the Church to set. The poor will be oppressed and despised, if their only earthly patron do not take them by the hand, befriend them, console them, and treat them with the respect due to ransomed and consecrated souls and bodies. She is the only authorized and able asserter of their civil and social rights. When she hides her face from them, their whole horizon is darkened, and they will wander in vain, and lose themselves in trackless labyrinths, following the delusive imitations of that dignity and equality which they have lost.

The Church, we said above, is the poor man's court of justice. He has no other. It is a saying in the mouth of every one, that Laws are made to protect the strong, not the weak. The laws cannot concern themselves with small things. They assert principles, and so are a political testimony to the obligation of justice. They can do little more as far as the poor are concerned. Nor should we wish to see it otherwise. A multiplicity of particular laws made for the poor, would increase their misery, and be utterly ineffective; for law *cannot* reach their position, any more than it can the relations of parent and child, or husband and wife. Law protects chiefly its own creations, wealth and privilege. What it makes, it preserves, viz. the rights of rank and property. But the poor have no rank or property of the law's creation. Their experience of the law is chiefly passive. Looking to the mere outside of things, and without inquiring into rights and motives, it may always be said, in a certain sense, "Do not rich men oppress you, and draw you before the judgment-seats?" Generally speaking, the rights of the rich can be asserted by the law; generally speaking, the rights of the poor cannot, because they are matters, not of positive institution, but of nature, of feeling, and of custom. When the moral tone of the country is unchristianized, it is all one whether the poor are serfs by law, or citizens by law. Their poverty in both cases is equally weak, contemptible, and ridiculous. It devolves on the Church, therefore, to assert in her own courts the rights of the poor. She must exhibit a picture of Christian equality, as an edifying lesson to the world; and put her poor and helpless in that honourable position, which shall render any thing which injures or degrades them an obvious offence against the Church, and shocking to the common feeling of Christians.

Some of our readers may perhaps be disposed to smile at our having launched out into so wide a subject as that of Christian equality, and having, as they may also think, overstated it to a dangerous extent, all on the matter of Pews. But the Bible assures us, in a thousand passages, that it is of the last importance to have an outward order and arrangement in harmony with the inward meaning. The world is keenly alive to this truth whenever its own interests are concerned, and only chooses to decry it when the spiritual order happens to interfere with its own arrangements. It is as important that the Church should visibly dispose and inform its congregation so as to illustrate spiritual truths, as it is for the sovereign to order his court with regard to rules of authority and precedence, or for the general to marshal his army with a view to strength and power. Order is heaven's first law—necessary to all perfection, all strength and beauty. "As the sun when it ariseth in the heaven, so is the beauty of a

good wife in the ordering of her house." With the Epistle of St. James, the Lord's brother, before us, we are not in the least afraid of seeming to exaggerate the importance of our subject. He thinks it necessary to enjoin that the poor should not sit under the footstool of the rich, even in the courts of justice, lest judges and juries should be biassed by the evident superiority of wealth and rank. Suffering rich and poor to occupy this comparative position, he calls a transgression and a sin—the sin, namely, of modifying and impairing Christian faith with personal and worldly considerations: "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool; are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts? Hearken, my beloved brethren; hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him? But *ye* have despised the poor."

Now if such reasonings are applicable, and if such precautions are necessary before a legal tribunal, for such, notwithstanding its voluntary and informal character, seems to be here implied, how much more are they in the place and during the act of Christian worship. A secular court, in a secular question, might, one would suppose, be allowed to recognize secular distinctions, providing that it was on its guard not to be unduly influenced thereby. But if it be not allowable in this case, how much less in the highest spiritual act, before the Father of Spirits, the Maker of rich and poor:—how much less in that place and occasion which aspires to be the very threshold and foretaste of heaven, the highest opportunity and most perfect operation of our being; that glorious spot of brightness in our existence to which we endeavour to assimilate all the rest of our lives, so far as the mixed material of our appointed earthly work will allow. Often and often does the anxious mind of the Christian desire, if it were possible, to see earthly things projected on some heavenly reflex, that he might know how things of time look in eternity, how the maze of providence there is to be extricated, how human schemes compare with the divine will,—for he knows that many things which are highly esteemed among men are an abomination in the sight of God,—and often does he wish to see a pattern of heavenly things towards which to train and guide the world. Such a reflex, such a vision the Church is designed to be, and such the humblest village church should present.

This is well expressed in a paragraph which has lately appeared in the newspapers, as part of the Bishop of Exeter's recent charge, though we cannot find it in what is apparently the most authentic report. Whoever is the writer, its intrinsic force and beauty is such that our readers will be glad to take it on its own merits.

"That it should be endeavoured to create worldly distinctions in the temple dedicated to, and devoted to the worship of, the true and living God, must strike the mind as extraordinary. That temple in which all who appear have sinned, and all have the forgiveness of those sins to pray for. There it is, if no where else, that the rich and the poor meet together, for the Lord is the Maker of them all. There every one is upon an equal footing with his neighbour,—undistinguished in the eye of God, save by the manner in which their duties are discharged, and the proper exercise of those qualities with which he has blessed them—of the head and of the heart. There no one has claim to be distinguished above the rest of mankind, seeing that here is presented a type of that which will be hereafter, when the first shall be last, and the last first."

There is a deep and mysterious feeling in the heart of man, which associates all the distinctions of time with the idea of dissolution, and views all earthly pride as the gaudy precursor of a funeral pageant. The thought of prince and peasant leads imperceptibly to a third term, and that is death. That all shall die is the one great *truth;* but the great *tragedy* is that rich and poor, king and subject descend to a common grave, whither wealth and pomp do not follow. Now Scripture seems to sanction this feeling. We might instance many passages, but will content ourselves with one contrast. In that awful passage of the Apocalyptic vision, where earth is represented as expecting the day of wrath, mankind are spoken of according to their ranks and degrees, as if this was a natural and fit occasion to remember them. "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the rocks, and in the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" But how utterly are such differences put out of sight in the description of them that are sealed; "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindred, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." The Church is the Heavenly

Jerusalem, the kingdom of heaven upon earth; in more immediate contact with the world, she cannot keep up that look and air of heaven which marks her first origin, her present reality, and her final consummation; but in her own holy courts she can, and ought to show herself as she is. There at least she ought to exhibit rather the triumphant church than the perishing world.

A very little consideration will show that it is merely a fact in the condition of human society, and not a crime in the governing classes, that the Church is the poor man's court of justice, and that formal legislation can scarcely apprehend and deal with so delicate and inartificial a matter as the rights and privileges, and just dignity of the poor. The poor must always depend most largely upon the kindness and considerateness of the rich of every degree; they are at the mercy of the rich: it is true the rich also depend on the poor, even more absolutely and indispensably than the poor on the rich, but not so immediately: the rich, using the word in its most comprehensive sense, have the making of the laws; the rich have method, unity of operation, and free communication; the rich are a whole, the very head of society. The rich can pass laws refusing maintenance except on their own conditions; they can besides make extensive private though legal combinations against the poor; they can hold out indefinitely. The rich can also with great plausibility apply to the poor the principles of their own commerce one with another; they can give only for direct and immediate equivalents, a principle which to the poor is certain destruction, as a fourth part of the poor, and every poor person for a fourth of his life, has no equivalent to offer, and is necessarily dependent. The poor have both the facts and the theory on their side, namely, the fact that they produce the necessaries and comforts of life, and the theory that they ought themselves to be allowed a sufficiency thereof: but the rich have the adjustment of facts and theory, and may be blind to the facts, or may warp the theory as much as they please. We do not dwell longer on this point, as our object is merely to show that the rights of the poor are not and cannot be a matter of written law, but must come in a great measure under the head of charity, or the Church's unwritten law of love. It is therefore to be expected that as the poor are treated by the Church, so will they be by the world at large; or rather, to speak with greater accuracy, as they are treated in the forms and offices of the Church, so will they in the secular order, i. e. the social customs and political enactments of the whole Christian people.

Let us see whether the parallel do not hold good in these days; the parallel, namely, between the treatment of the poor in and out of Church. The charity of the nation is pinched and tainted:

so has been the charity of the Church, whence the charity of the nation takes its leaven. First for the Church. Poverty is *there* the only crime and disqualification. There was a time when the only order of propinquity to the altar was that which had a religious reference: below the priests were disposed the communicants, below whom were the catechumens, and lowest, that is, in an outer porch, the penitents: while the impenitent and obstinate non-communicants were utterly excluded. The practice now is not to excommunicate for the greatest crimes, for the most inveterate and flagrant sins, excepting only poverty, *the one* sin in our days. The rich man now, whether he ever approaches the altar or not, or is properly admissible or not, walks up to the "chief seat" in the Church, "his upper room" or pew; he there prays if he does indeed pray "with himself," apparently thankful far nothing excepting that he is not poor as other men are, for which he probably thanks himself. The poor does indeed stand afar off, for he cannot choose but to do so, in some place of very little estimation, with many a wide and almost empty pew between him and the sanctuary, if he be admitted to the church at all; for more probably he is cast out of the synagogue for his poverty, and prays or prays not in his cottage or in the conventicle. He does not even sit at the footstool of the rich man. He is put out of sight altogether, as an eyesore and a nuisance. Nay a more shocking distinction must be added. When the poor man of our populous manufacturing towns asks for the offices of the Church, they are indeed prepared for him, but hurried, irreverent, and mutilated. They are reduced as much as possible to the appearance of civil processes. The fee is really treated as the most essential part. It is impossible to say how much the baptismal service is curtailed and altered *in usum pauperum*. The marriage service is shorn of some of its most needful prayers and exhortations. The increase of our poor population has not been prayed for as a gift of God; and the Church has passed by her first and chief opportunity of asking at His altar that the forthcoming generation may be Christianly and virtuously brought up to the praise and honour of God: what wonder if that increase of population which has not been sought as a blessing should be sent as a curse? What wonder if the increase of the nation is not also the increase of the Church, when she has forborne to pray for increase? The unhappy poor, too unacquainted, if not altogether so, with the teaching of the Church and the Bible, enter on the many trials of marriage without the peculiarly fitting exhortation and instruction of the Church as to the intention of that ordinance, and the duties of that relation. Nay the crime and excommunication of poverty pursues the poor to the very grave. There were

once in this country many significant rites of sepulture, which were common to rich and poor; the law or ordinance which abolished them, specially provided that whatever had been used to indicate the rank or wealth of the deceased, should still be allowed. But not to go so far back; in many towns, the body of the poor man is not permitted to enter the church, though he was perhaps its most constant attendant, and at least that portion of the service, if not more, is omitted.

Again, Christian alms, the divinely appointed portion of the aged, the orphan, the widow, the sick, and the needy, were once offered upon the altar, and given from the altar as a holy oblation, and an act and part of Christian communion. The poor were treated with more than respect—with reverence, with worship, as Christ's deputies and receivers. They were associated with the priest. The "sentences" made their cause one with that of the "ministers." Now the poor are thrust out of sight into living graves, for we cannot call them aught else. There is no grace, no religion in any single stage of the collection or application of the poor-rate; not the smallest attempt to bring the blessing of God upon it. Poverty is treated as a sin or a leprosy, to be restrained to a prison or a lazaretto. The poor do not even worship in the same house as their rich brethren, but in a separate chapel, with suitable circumstances of dinginess and melancholy. The right of the Christian poor, if they be poor indeed, to a sufficient and dignified maintenance, without disgrace or confinement,—a right which we hold to be at least as good and demonstrable as that by which our Sovereign wears her crown, or any land-owner receives the rent of his land, or the parson his tithe—has been utterly repudiated by the State, though we rejoice to say, enough of Christian feeling remains to mitigate immensely the rigorous letter of the law.

Would that both rich and poor might understand this evident law of Providence, that as the poor are treated *in* the church, so are they treated and so do they fare out of the church. Their degradation is the fault not of one class or another but of all. Nor is this degradation their own loss alone—it is the loss of all. The Church loses grace and strength by their alienation. If they loved the Church, the Church would love, honour and cherish them. Loved, honoured and cherished by the Church, they would no longer be hated, despised and cast out by the usages of society and the laws of the realm.

Our unforeseen length compels us to pass very hastily over the publications which we intended at starting to make the groundwork of our remarks. Milford Malvoisin we particularly regret that we cannot dwell upon more leisurely and comfortably;

but at the sixtieth page of an article, it becomes necessary to adopt a pace of business rather than of amusement. We had marked several brilliant passages for quotation; now, however, we have no alternative but to refer our readers to the original. The tale, or series of historical or rather dramatic sketches, descriptive of the fortunes of Milford Malvoisin Church, is very happily conceived, and most effectively executed. Any thing, so very diverting, could not be expected to escape objection. Some people say that Mr. Paget does not sufficiently respect the natural prejudices of quiet ladies and gentlemen, whose church feelings have become inseparably associated with roomy, comfortable and secluded pews, and who would feel strangely naked without them. He certainly does not spare them; but hard-hearted and hard-headed, as it may seem, we must confess that we have absolutely no patience with a class of people, who, with at least an average portion of the blessings of this life, enjoying ease, consideration, and innumerable helps to religion, have shown themselves so culpably indifferent towards that other forlorn and helpless class, which God has especially commanded us to care for—and declares that *He* also specially cares for—the Christian poor. The sight of a lady or gentleman, however kind, and benevolent, and pious, and venerable, occupying the space of a dozen people close to the minister, while a dozen poor people are huddled or scattered, suffocated or starved, in some cold, unwholesome corner, at the other end of the church, or, worse still, actually excluded, is quite *shocking* to us; *shocking*, both as regards the religion of that lady or gentleman, and as regards the treatment of those poor Christians. We do not think, therefore, that Mr. Paget has dealt a bit more severely with these people than they deserve. The second objection we have heard people make to the volume is, that the humour is sometimes rather too broad. Undoubtedly, in one or two places it is of the broadest; but when great and inveterate absurdities are to be exposed, and must be treated with ridicule rather than solemn indignation, it is not easy to hit the exact line of propriety. Going along, as we did, with Mr. Paget, in the spirit of the book, we were too much diverted to stop and canvass the incidents, or measure the words. We should have thought this an ill return to the writer for the amusement and edification he had afforded us. Whatever people may feel on this point, we are quite sure that there is nothing really untrue, or even exaggerated, in the impressions which the tale is designed to convey. We believe it to be as true as history, and even truer. Indeed, notwithstanding a little extravagance in the mere dressings and externals of his narratives, we think Mr. Paget substantially far truer to nature, that is, a far closer observer and more faithful

recorder of the moral laws of our nature, than some much graver and more straightlaced tale writers we could mention, who disguise real extravagance, and blindness to moral laws, by a certain sobriety and good keeping in the mere details of their composition. As for any more particular eulogium on the book, or any animadversions, if we had them, they would by this time be quite superfluous. A tale, which has reached the third edition, is tolerably independent of reviewers. We will only add a commendation of the book to the use of such persons as are gathering money and resolution to attack the pew monopolies in their churches. It may be used either beforehand, to prepare the way, and preoccupy the mind of the parish with a few sound maxims, lively images, and, above all, an appropriate nomenclature on the subject of pews; or may be applied like a petard, or a mine, to blow up some compact and obstinate mass of opposition, after it has set and hardened itself against any gentler or graver style of remonstrance.

As it is possible that what we have said will give our readers a partial impression of the work, as being chiefly one of amusement, whereas, in fact, it contains a rich and continuous vein of deep reflection, and most humane, just, and religious sentiment, we will not leave it without one extract; and that shall be from the introduction.

" 'And yet,' I reflected further, as a fresh train of thought suggested itself, 'though this house of God has in some sense remained the same amid the vicissitudes of ages, even here as I look around me I can trace the lamentable effects of worldly fashion intruding where it ought not, and feel that to one who has Catholic feelings it is *not* the same as it was, even within my own recollection. When I was a boy that old dark cavern of a pew, which hides one-half of the rood screen, was the only one to be found in this church. There were none of the distinctions of worldly rank kept up in God's presence; we all knelt and worshipped side by side, high and low, rich and poor one with another. We felt that we were all on an equality, in that all were miserable sinners who needed pardon; in that all were petitioners for the same gifts of grace; in that we were all members one of another. But we have been gradually forgetting our privileges of Christian fellowship, and fostering even in holy things a spirit of pride, luxury and exclusiveness. Scarce a year has gone by in which somebody has not craved permission to erect his pew—the license has been granted, and so at length the poor of Christ's flock, instead of having (as they ought if there is to be a distinction) the best and choicest places reserved for them (as is meet for those who need all possible advantages of external aid towards hearing and understanding the service)—the poor are forced by these encroaching pews nearer and nearer to the door, and as far as possible from the officiating minister; nay, in many places through the multi-

tudes of these wicked abominations, we have left room for no other description of seats in the church. We have thrust forth the poor from the house of God, and verily we shall have our reward.'

" 'Alas, we know not what we are doing! Our pride, our luxury and our exclusiveness have succeeded in disuniting all the ties which of old united the several classes of our population: the rich have well nigh alienated the hearts of the poor. One link yet holds them together—the strongest of all—the bond of church-fellowship: break that, and there is nothing left to hold the social system together. We have sown the wind; may God have mercy upon those who live to see the whirlwind harvest!'

" The twilight was now gathering so fast around me, that I rose from my seat, and quitting the church proceeded homewards; but the last subject on which I had been reflecting still kept its place in my thoughts, and as I pondered on the unmitigated evil of the pew-system (for indeed I could find no one argument in favour of it), and recalled to mind the various mischiefs which even within my own limited experience have accrued from it—as I reflected on the ill-will which it is sure to engender, the envy, hatred, malice and uncharitableness which the possessing or the desire of possessing pews continually causes among neighbours, I felt that if the subject were once fairly set before right-minded people—if the system was exhibited in its true light to them, they would be the first to break through it, and, by turning their own pews into open sittings, show that, in so far as such a trifling act can bear witness to it, they are anxious to prove themselves in something more than name disciples of Him who for our sakes became poor and of no reputation."—pp. 10—13.

" The History of Pews" is a graver performance, though not without a spice of humour. We really think it is one of the most successful specimens of antiquarian research, directed to a useful end, we have ever met. We could not have anticipated that so much curious information could be brought to bear upon the subject. Nobody can pretend to understand the true state of the case in all its bearings, as regards the comparative claims of pews and open benches, until he has perused this very compendious and interesting little brochure, which will cost him a mere trifle of money or time. The following introductory sentences will best explain the nature and the moral of the Essay.

" The subject on which the committee have requested me to offer, this evening, some remarks to the Society, is one so interwoven with the internal arrangement of our churches, so directly bearing on the reverent performance of our services, and so powerfully influencing not the taste alone, but the devotional feelings of our worshippers, that, uninviting as it may at first sight appear, we are in fact deeply interested in it. And I was the more willing to lay before you whatever information I may have been able to procure on it, because *pues* have never yet found an historian. Nor need we wonder at this; for what is the

history of pues but the history of the intrusion of human pride, and selfishness, and indolence into the worship of God? a painful tale of our downward progress from the Reformation to the Revolution: the view of a constant struggle to make Canterbury approximate to Geneva, to assimilate the Church to the conventicle. In all this contest the introduction of pues, as trifling a thing as it may seem, has exercised no small influence for ill; and an equally powerful effect for good would follow their extirpation. Hence it is, that from the first moment of our existence as a society, we have declared an internecine war against them: that we have denounced them as eye-sores and heart-sores: that we have recommended their eradication in spite of all objections and at whatever expense: that we have never listened to a plea for the retention of one; for we knew well that, if we could not destroy them, they would destroy us.

"And herein we have but trodden in the steps of the holy martyrs and confessors of the seventeenth century, who sealed the Church's cause with their blood against those who 'turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction.' They not only denounced in their writings, in their sermons, in their charges, in their articles these innovations, but against more than one of them it was made matter of accusation and persecution that he had done so.

"It has been my object in the following paper to connect the History of Pues with that of the various changes which our Church has experienced; and scanty as the notices which I have been able to collect may appear to some, I may assure the society they have been procured at the expense of no little labour, and with the sacrifice of no little time; and this too in a place which affords every advantage for research. It is evident that all we can now learn of pues must be picked up on the one hand from the personal inspection of churches, and on the other, from a careful perusal of visitation articles, injunctions, party-pamphlets, plays, trials, satires and publications of a like ephemeral character, only to be found in large and valuable libraries. I have looked through many hundred tracts of this nature in the public library, and have been obliged to consider myself well off if two or three hours' research has helped me to one fresh notice or allusion. The best collection of the kind, not only in Cambridge, but perhaps in England, is to be found in the library of Trinity College. Some benefactor has at great cost and trouble made an invaluable collection of political and theological pamphlets put forth between 1638 and 1648. And these he has for the most part arranged so as to throw mutual light on each other; for example—does parliament publish an ordinance for 'seeking the Lord' by a solemn fast on Christmas-day? Bitterly in the next pamphlet does the Mercurius Rusticus inveigh against so unheard-of piece of profanity. Does the great parliamentary bookseller, 'Michael Sparke, living in Green-harbour in the Little Old Bailey,' publish 'Groans of our Sion, or a comfort for afflicted Protestants?' Leonard Lichfield of Oxford, and Richard Badger in Cornhill, the Parker and the Rivingtons of their days, hasten to reply to it; the one in 'A Rod for the Foole's back;' the other in 'The Devil at Geneva.' Such are the sources whence the following pages have been compiled."—pp. 3—5.

The writer, who, with what we should call a certain anti-pew modesty of character, does not give his name in the title-page, proceeds to make out very satisfactorily the following main points, which we give, with a few remarks of our own interspersed. First, he proves that pews, in the modern sense of the word, were not in use before the Reformation; the word pew, in ancient writers, meaning a seat or bench, and sometimes other things, but never what we call a pew; and that for more than a century after, the word was often used in the old sense. In Anglo-Saxon churches, and others of later date, there was a stone bench running all round the interior, except the east end; which, of course, would not accommodate many; nor do we think many did sit in those days. Judging from Anglo-Saxon illuminations, the rest of the people sat on low, rude, three-legged stools, placed dispersedly all over the church.

We have said above that it was usual to sit on the ground, but can only produce two authorities at the present moment. The first is a painting in a MS. in the Harleian Library in the British Museum, dated A.D. 1319, representing Archbishop Arundel preaching to the people from a pulpit raised about two feet from the ground, his cross-bearer standing by his side, and his hearers all sitting on the ground. A copy is given in "Strutt's Antiquities." The second is a drawing of a friar preaching from a moveable pulpit, given in the "Pictorial History of England," after a short account of the rise of the mendicant orders, without date, but probably belonging to the 15th century. In this instance the scene is probably not in a church, and the ground appears to be covered with branches of trees or growing plants; but still the posture represented goes to confirm the supposition of that being customary in churches. Formerly, when the annual sermon was preached on the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist, from the stone pulpit before the chapel at Magdalene College, the whole area before it was covered with rushes and grass, to represent, it is said, the wilderness, and, doubtless, also, for the accommodation of the hearers; the seats being set for the university authorities.

To return to our "History:" as late at least as the end of the thirteenth century none of the laity, except noblemen and patrons, were allowed certain fixed seats—seats for themselves, not large square pews—the rule for all others being, that "he who shall first enter, shall take his place where he will." As the Reformation began to dawn, prescription in favour of particular seats began to avail, especially where proved by the fact of repairs; but still no pews.

"In descending to the Reformation it is necessary to remember how

different was the then state of our parish churches from their present condition. There were no pues, as we have seen; no reading-desk, often no pulpit; the old altars for the most part in parish churches and in all cathedrals remained; for it must always be remembered that these, by the so often and so triumphantly quoted injunction of Queen Elizabeth, were not ordered—only under certain restrictions allowed—to be removed: in some instances a table stood lengthwise at the east end, and in others was brought down into the chancel or nave, where even our present rubric permits it to stand. In this latter case matins and even-song seem to have been read from it; in the former, I suppose, that a lettern was used, being placed where the priest could best be heard.

"I will now endeavour to trace historically the gradual intrusion of pue, reading-pue, gallery and the other encumbrances of modern churches.

"In King Edward's first Prayer-book the priest is ordered to be in the choir; but Bucer having declared the order an act of high treason against God, the injunction in the second places him in such place of the church, chapel or chancel as the people may best hear."—pp. 14—16.

This led to the construction of what is called in various documents quoted, "a decent and convenient seat in the body of the church, where the minister may sit or stand,"—"a pulpit, where prayers are wont to be said,"—"a little tabernacle of wainscot," "turned towards the people,"—that is, a reading desk. The pew for the priest was the first step towards pews for the people. "Hoc fonte derivata clades, In patriam populumque fluxit." "Here," says our writer, "we may date the rise of pews. For when the clergyman had his, the squire, the franklin, the yeoman, each in their turn clamoured for theirs: and the evil came in like a flood."

Pews, then, seem to have come in with the seventeenth century, not without a very severe struggle. The earliest record found by our writer on the Church Schemes supplied to the Camden Society, is 1602; but as a north gallery is found of the date of 1581, we doubt not pews will be found as early. From this date to the Rebellion are many notices, some very curious, and some very entertaining, as indicative of the temper of the times, and the ethical and religious differences of the Catholic and Puritan parties. Bishops Wren and Montague, Dr. Pocklington and other writers, were very zealous in their warfare against these novelties, so much so, that the destruction of pews was one of the crimes for which the former was deprived. "Are there any privy closets or close pews in your church?" asks Wren in his Articles, "Are any pews so loftily made that they do any way hinder the prospect of the church or chancel? so that they which

be in them are hidden from the face of the congregation." And again, "What galleries are there in your church?" &c.

One confessor in this good cause, and that very early in it, we are surprised to find omitted. It is John Thornborough, who, A. D. 1603, was translated from the see of Limerick to Bristol. Britton, in his history of that cathedral, gives an account of what followed, on the authority of the Bristol memorialist:

"Thornborough was unhappily embroiled in dissensions with the corporation of Bristol, and with others of his diocesans. During the years 1606-7 he never visited the city. In the former year the mayor and council obtained leave from the dean and chapter to erect a gallery within the cathedral, and constructed the same near the pulpit. The bishop on visiting Bristol in 1608, caused it to be immediately pulled down, when the citizens, indignant at this assumption of power, represented the case to the king, who appointed commissioners to examine whether 'the gallery made the church look like a playhouse,' as reported. Their answer being in the negative, Thornborough was compelled to reconstruct it at his own expense. This was accordingly done, but placed about three feet only from the ground; and at the same time the pulpit was removed to such a distance that it was impossible for persons sitting in the gallery to hear the officiating minister. The civic authorities made a second application to his majesty, who, when Thornborough next appeared at court, rebuked him so sharply that he left London and proceeded to Dorchester, and 'would not come to Bristol for shame and disgrace.' Continuing, however, to annoy the citizens, the mayor applied to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and obtained some redress; but the corporation for several years attended divine service at the church of St. Mary's, Redcliff. In the year 1613 the affair seems to have been so far compromised that the city officers returned to the cathedral: this, however, might have been in compliment to Queen Anne, who in that year visited the city, and with great parade and ceremony attended that church. Three years afterwards Thornborough was translated to Worcester, where he died in 1641, at the advanced age of ninety-four."

There is one point in this "History of Pews" which we think very important, and *very* true, using the adverb "very" in that comparative sense which is allowable on *moral* subjects. We say this because we think the argument is made slightly more formal and rigorous than the mixed character of the facts will allow. Fashions and customs are a rather insoluble material for the analytical inquirer. Men are often *really* influenced by considerations which they feel only indirectly and recognize but dimly; and which for that reason they would consider themselves justified in repudiating very stoutly. Thus the four ritual considerations enlarged upon by the historian of pews undoubtedly had their weight, as *really* as if it had been even so directly and confessedly: still we should be fully prepared for the

circumstance of a conscientious Puritan pew builder, according to the light and measure of his conscience, resolutely denying that he liked a high pew because it enabled him to abstain with impunity from customary and, as he thought, superstitious acts of reverence. We say this, because we think it will be replied that all our historian's proofs amount to, is merely this, that the Puritans were remarkably fond of high walled pews—that the Catholic part of the Church strongly objected to this, as for other reasons, so especially on the ground that under their shelter the Puritans refused to perform certain bounden acts of reverence—that notwithstanding this public and strenuous objection, the Puritans did more and more enlarge and exalt their pews, and persecuted unto death those of the clergy who had expressed that objection, and partly on the very ground of that objection. This may appear to some people as much as the strongest opponents of pews and Puritans would wish to prove; but to our judgment it stops just short of the conclusion that Puritans did either build or like pews, because pews screened irreverent practices. To our minds it only comes to this;—we have the allegation of their Catholic contemporaries, and have reasonable grounds for suspecting, that the allegation was not unfounded. As we have hinted above, the inquiry turns upon a question of conscience and motives, and that is a complex and subtle affair.

"We have seen," says this writer, "that pues were supported by Puritans and attacked by churchmen. We must now inquire into the reasons of this fact; for it is a mistake to suppose that it was only the love of comfort and ease, and a pharisaical desire of separating themselves from their neighbours, which led the former to uphold—and only a zeal for the beauty of God's houses which induced the latter to denounce them; besides these more obvious causes there were others as substantial at work on both sides.

"It must be remembered, that in an age when the bishop's injunctions to churchwardens were so stringent, and when a presentment for contumacy involved consequences so serious, that those who were determined on disobeying episcopal authority were at least willing as much as possible to conceal their disobedience; and pues afforded them an excellent method of doing so.

"I shall mention four of the principal uses of the church at which Puritans took offence; in all of which high pues would form a very convenient shelter."—p. 28.

These four uses were, bowing at the name of Jesus, standing at the *Gloria Patri*, bowing towards the altar, and kneeling at Holy Communion, which it was a Puritan fashion to administer from seat to seat, wherever the communicants happened to be. The writer winds up an interesting sketch of the controversy on the first of these uses with the following rather conclusive sentence:—

"I have dwelt at some length on this point, because I wished you to be aware of the influence it had on the erection of pues; and we shall not now be surprised to find in a copy of Bishop Montague's Articles, preserved in Trinity College library, at the side of the question, 'do they . . . bend or bow at the glorious, sacred and sweet name of Jesus?' the following note in an old hand, 'wee colde not presente by reason of ye high and close pewes.' "—p. 32.

We will not dwell upon the other points, except to notice the important testimony of Dr. Udal, a repentant Puritan, to the novelty of pews and of "galleries for your youth to sit in, that were wont to stand at the master and dame's pew doors;" and also to the actual connection between pews and irreverent practices.

It is always difficult to trace, to their motives, actions and usages which result from so many diverse sources. Perhaps, after all, this comes more within the province of "fiction," as it is called, than of philosophic inquiry. It requires a certain artistical power. Motives must be just alluded to, faintly shadowed forth, and invested with that dimness and uncertainty which characterizes their influence in the actual fact. Thus we almost think that Mr. Paget has come nearer the mark in his dramatic account of the first erection of Mr. Blote's pew, and the subsequent disastrous casualty by which it became the cause of his death. For Mr. Blote being seized with a fit of apoplexy in his lofty inclosure, his real condition could not be seen, and it was mistaken for one of his usual heavy slumbers, under which impression the unhappy gentleman was left to his fate, till at the end of the sermon he was found dead, purely for want of a little timely aid. The account of the former event we will quote.

"He then gradually assumed great dignity of manner, and after speaking with deep satisfaction of his having been the humble instrument for the reformation of the parish church, and for the rooting out of superstition; 'I have now good hope,' said he, 'that we shall have painful gospel-preaching ministers, and a place of worship no longer contaminated with popery;—yea, a place in which I can appear without scruple; and therefore, Tristram Sugge, do you go down to the church immediately, and with the wainscoting which we have pulled down to-day, do you erect a goodly pew, meet for a person in my station, wherein I can sit at mine ease, and judge of the doctrines of the preacher, without being crowded upon or discommoded by the common wretches who used to crawl to hear old Dolben.'

"Under such circumstances a structure was erected, whose history, for the next two hundred years, we now propose to set before our readers, with greater or less minuteness, as circumstances seem to require."

Now it is the fact in our days, that pews are valued and occa-

sionally defended, not so much because they shield conscientious irreverence, (though it is also to be considered that the people who would value them on this account have generally withdrawn to the meeting-house,) but because they save the better sort from suffering the exposures which people are apt to make in church from sheer indolence or carelessness. Thus we are told that "many ladies and gentlemen, especially when advanced in years, cannot kneel without pain,"—an infirmity which we are sure must be the result of wrong habits, and especially of a prayerless habit; again, we are told that "some ladies and gentlemen are peculiarly apt to be drowsy in church, being of weakly or lethargic constitutions;" and it is argued, in both these cases, that it is not meet ladies and gentlemen should be exposed to the vulgar eye, as they might occasionally become obnoxious to a few smiles; while no such disposition is shown to screen or palliate the weariness of the tired labourer or his family after their six days' uninterrupted toil. Nay, this disposition to protect the frailties of the wealthier and more educated from their just penalties, extends to the very children. Young ladies and gentlemen are apt to be restless, to have their little jokes and interchange of looks at the preacher, or the clerk, or the singers, or some queer old man or old woman in church; and for good example sake, as well as for other weighty reasons, it is better they should not be seen by the mass of the congregation, especially by the younger part of it.

When the Camden Society possesses a "church scheme" of every church in the kingdom, and certainly such diligent inquirers and careful analysts deserve this courtesy from the incumbent of every church, we think it will be found necessary to qualify or explain the following paragraph, which yet we think substantially true.

"It is a remarkable fact, that between the years 1646 and 1660 scarcely any pues would appear to have been erected. I have never seen a single instance of one bearing date within this period; and this may serve to prove the truth of what I have been saying with respect to the reasons which led the Puritans to adopt them. For now that the cause was gone—now that people might sit, stand or lie down as they pleased at the communion—might abstain from bowing towards the altar or at the Holy Name—the effect ceased too."—pp. 45, 46.

Does this refer merely to pews of remarkable size and height, or to the pews of any kind, so as they have doors, and are higher than the old open benches? With regard to the former we will not venture to speak, but surely examples of the latter belonging to this date are not uncommon. We will give one instance from an entry in a parish register, confirmed by a date on a tie beam in the church:—"The parish church of Choldrington (Wilts) being repaired, and the seats of the church new

erected, the seats were disposed of by the minister, churchwardens, overseers and other ye parishioners in manner following. September 24, 1659." After which follows a very reasonable plan of appropriation, if there had been the least prospect of its being kept to, the pews being also of reasonable dimensions and height, though since enormously enlarged and raised; this, perhaps, will not be deemed an exception, as the repairing and re-pewing of the church had probably become a matter of necessity, and the pews then erected certainly were not such as could screen the ill practices referred to. We were lately informed of another instance of pews erected in the Commonwealth, but have not yet been able to procure a transcript from the register in which it is recorded.

"The History of Pews," like all other English histories, ecclesiastical or civil, stops at the Revolution; the subsequent course of things being of that easy downward character which baffles alike the skill of the historian, the poet and the divine. Nothing can be made of it; it is mere waste and offal, and is resigned by the consent of all to be the prey of hacks and drudges, the vultures of literature. The Church had been effectually puritanized under the Commonwealth, and the inroad of pews was feebly resisted during the ensuing reign, "Sir Christopher Wren making a gallant though unsuccessful stand against their introduction into his London churches." In 1686 occurs the first instance met with by our writer of the income of a clergyman being made dependant on his pew rents; and shortly after we find pews spoken of with admiration as contributing to the beauty and magnificence of churches. A century followed which suffered more churches to go to ruin than it built, transmitting less to posterity than it received; which sent out colonies without a church; which suffered our sister-church of Scotland to be all but extirpated with fire and sword; which starved and frowned away the poor, the broken-hearted, and the enthusiastic from the living channels of truth and grace, to quench their thirst as best they could: this century will be known to the future historian of our churches as the builder of pews and galleries—the defacer and secularizer of the house of God;—that will have been its work. Would that we could consider the century now fairly over, and could really treat it as a matter of history! The writer of this essay concludes with a most energetic summons to a crusade against this innovation. His tone may appear over-wrought to such as philosophically hold that externals have nothing to do with religion, but will be at least respectfully received by all who remember the zeal for the Lord's house so repeatedly shown in Scripture.

ART. VI.—1. *The City of the Mormons, or Three Days at Nauvoo in* 1842. By the Rev. Henry Caswall, M.A., Author of "America and the American Church," and Professor of Divinity in Kemper College, St. Louis, Missouri. London: Rivingtons.

2. *Mormonism in all Ages: or, the Rise, Progress, and Causes of Mormonism, with the Biography of its Author and Founder Joseph Smith, Jun.* By Professor J. B. Turner, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois. New York, London: Wiley and Putnam.

3. *The Book of Mormon: an Account written by the hand of Mormon, upon Plates taken from the Plates of Nephi, &c.* By Joseph Smith, Jun. Palmyra. 1830.

4. *Times and Seasons.* City of Nauvoo, Illinois. 1841.

MR. HENRY CASWALL, whose account of the state of religious affairs in the United States was read with so much interest two or three years since, and was thought so full of encouragement on the one hand, and warning on the other, that it was put on the general list of the Christian Knowledge Society, has now done us a new service in his capacity of link and negociator between the English and American Churches, by the publication at the head of our list, giving a short and pithy account of a visit to the head-quarters of the most monstrous heresy of the age. And, by the way, the thanks of the public are due to Mr. Caswall for the form in which he has given the results of his visit. It was a service of no little trouble and danger also, involving a journey to an utmost corner of the habitable world, and to a sect accustomed it appears to rather summary methods of dealing with dangerous or suspected people; his matter is entirely original, as fresh as if it were the moon, or the haunts of a megalotherion, he had just been visiting; and with the vast additional stock of information on the subject which we know he possesses, he might, with every regard to appearances and real justice, have expanded his book to one or even two substantial octavos. Nay, any experienced publisher would tell him that was his only chance of remuneration. He has clearly sacrificed himself "on the altar of public convenience," as the French would say, in giving to the world so brilliant and compendious a narrative within pocket-book compass, and at the cheap and inglorious price of eighteenpence. The book is then in outward form as well as in its substance an appeal to the good sense of the million, and amongst the million we hope it will be extensively distributed and read, English as well as American; for incredible as it may seem, the greater part of the recent converts to this extravagant

delusion are directly from England—sound, enlightened, Protestant England.

A short book requires a short article; and we have not room for a longer one; so we will proceed at once to the book itself.

Mr. Caswall finding, on his recent return from England, that the new college at St. Louis would not be ripe for the profitable exercise of his functions for about a twelvemonth, decided, on consultation with Bishop Kemper and his brother professors, that he would for the present best consult its interests by returning to plead its cause in England, which he is now doing as far as opportunity will allow. However, before his return, he chanced to discover, what might have passed under the eyes of many people without their discovering, that through St. Louis itself, from all parts of the world, there was actually flowing a continual stream of converts to the Mormon metropolis.

"Desiring to know something respecting the passengers in the last boat, I proceeded on board; and as soon as the stoppage of the steam permitted me to be heard, I inquired of the clerk of the boat how many persons he had brought from New Orleans. 'Plenty of live stock,' was his reply, 'plenty of live stock; we have three hundred English emigrants, all on their way to join Joe Smith, the prophet at Nauvoo.' I walked into that portion of the vessel appropriated to the poorer class of travellers, and here I beheld my unfortunate countrymen crowded together in a most comfortless manner. I addressed myself to some of them, and found they were from the neighbourhood of Preston in Lancashire. They were decent-looking people, and by no means of the lowest class. I took the liberty of questioning them respecting their plans, and found that they were indeed the dupes of the missionaries of Mormonism. I begged them to be on their guard, and suggested to them the importance of not committing themselves and their property to a person who had long been known in that country as a deceiver. They were, however, bent upon completing the journey which they had designed, and although they civilly listened to my statements, they professed to be guided in reference to the prophet by that perverted precept of Scripture; 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.'"—pp. 4, 5.

From this moment Mr. Caswall determined to visit the stronghold of the new religion, and to obtain, if possible, an interview with the prophet himself. He embarked on Friday evening, April 15th, in the steamer "Republic," having prudently laid aside his clerical dress; and in order to test the scholarship of the prophet, having provided himself with an ancient Greek manuscript of the Psalter, apparently of the thirteenth century. Early on the Sunday morning he was landed opposite Nauvoo, and in a few minutes crossed the river (Mississippi) in a long canoe filled with Mormons "going to meeting." It was more than half an hour before they had over-

come the difficulties and dangers of the passage, and Mr. Caswall found himself in this extraordinary city. It is built on a grand plan, accommodated to the bend of the river and to the site of "the temple."

"It was to this last-mentioned spot that with my companions I directed my steps. Having ascended the hill, I found myself close to a large unfinished stone building, the walls of which had advanced eight or ten feet above the ground. This was the Temple. The view of the winding Mississippi from this elevation was truly grand, and the whole of the lower part of the town was distinctly seen. I was informed by my companions that the population of Nauvoo was about ten thousand; but subsequent inquiry led me to place the estimate three or four thousand lower.

"The temple being unfinished, about half-past ten o'clock a congregation of perhaps two thousand persons assembled in a grove, within a short distance from the sanctuary. Their appearance was quite respectable, and fully equal to that of dissenting meetings generally in the western country. Many grey-headed old men were there, and many well-dressed females. I perceived numerous groups of the peasantry of Old England; their sturdy forms, their clear complexions, and their heavy movements, strongly contrasting with the slight figure, the sallow visage, and the elastic step of the American. There, too, were the bright and innocent looks of little children, who, born among the privileges of England's Church, baptized with her consecrated waters, and taught to lisp her prayers and repeat her Catechism, had now been led into this den of heresy, to listen to the ravings of a false prophet, and to imbibe the principles of a semi-pagan delusion.

"The officiating elders not having yet arrived, the congregation listened for some time to the performances of a choir of men and women, directed by one who appeared to be a professional singing-master. At length two elders came forward, and ascended a platform rudely constructed of planks and logs. One wore a blue coat, and his companion, a stout intemperate-looking man, appeared in a thick jacket of green baize. He in the blue coat gave out a hymn, which was sung, but with little spirit, by the congregation, all standing. He then made a few common-place remarks on the nature of prayer; after which, leaning forward on a railing in front of the platform, he began to pray. Having dwelt for a few minutes on the character and perfections of the Almighty, he proceeded in the following strain:—

"'We thank thee, O Lord, that thou hast in these latter days restored the gifts of prophecy, of revelation, of great signs and wonders, as in the days of old. We thank Thee that, as thou didst formerly raise up thy servant Joseph to deliver his brethren in Egypt, so Thou hast now raised up another Joseph to save his brethren from bondage to sectarian delusion, and to bring them into this great and good land, a land flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands, and which Thou didst promise to be an inheritance for the seed of Jacob for evermore. We pray for thy servant and prophet Joseph, that thou wouldest bless

him and prosper him, that although the archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him, his bow may abide in strength, and the arms of his hands may be made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob. We pray also for thy holy temple, that the nations of the earth may bring gold and incense, that the sons of strangers may build up its walls, and fly to it as a cloud, and as doves to their windows. We pray Thee also to hasten the ingathering of thy people, every man to his heritage and every man to his land. We pray that as thou hast set up this place as an ensign for the nations, so thou wouldest continue to assemble here the outcasts, and gather together the dispersed from the four corners of the earth. May every valley be exalted, and every mountain and hill be made low, and the crooked places strait, and the rough places plain, and may the glory of the Lord be revealed, and all flesh see it together! Bring thy sons from far, and thy daughters from the ends of the earth, and let them bring their silver and their gold with them.'

"Thus he proceeded for perhaps half an hour, after which he sat down, and the elder in green baize, having thrown aside his jacket,—for the heat of the sun was now considerable,—commenced a discourse."

The second elder's discourse was of a more argumentative character; on the necessity of a revelation for America as well as for Asia; on the probability of continual revelations; on the injustice done to the Divine Attributes by preconceived notions, especially by the Puritan system; not, however, without outbreaks of Mormon eloquence. After this "the meeting" seems to have passed by gentle transitions to a somewhat more secular and business-like tone.

"A hymn was now sung; and afterwards a tall, thin, New-England Yankee, with a strong nasal twang and provincial accent, rose up, and leaning forward on the railing, spoke for half an hour with great volubility. He said that his office required him to speak of business. They were all aware that God had by special revelation appointed a committee of four persons, and had required them to build a house unto his name, such a one as his servant Joseph should show them. That the said house should be called the 'Nauvoo House,' and should be for a house of boarding: that the kings and nobles of the earth and all weary travellers might lodge therein, while they should contemplate the word of the Lord, and the corner-stone, which He had appointed for Zion. That in this house the Lord had said that there should be reserved a suite of rooms for his servant Joseph, and his seed after him from generation to generation. And that the Lord had also commanded that stock should be subscribed by the saints, and received by the committee for the purpose of building the house. The speaker proceeded as follows: 'Now, brethren, the Lord has commanded this work, and the work *must* be done. Yes; it *shall* be done —it *will* be done. The Gentiles, the men of the world, tell us that such stock must pay twenty-five per cent. per annum, and the Lord hath required us to take stock; surely then, when duty and interest go together, you will not be backward to contribute. But only a small amount of stock has hitherto been taken, and the committee appointed by the

Lord have had to go on borrowing and borrowing until they can borrow no longer. In the mean time, the mechanics employed on the house want their pay, and the committee are not able to pay them. We have a boat ready to be towed up the river to the pine country, to get pine-wood for the edifice. We have a crew engaged, and all ready to start; but we cannot send out the expedition without money. The committee have made great personal sacrifices to fulfil the commandment of the Lord: I myself came here with seven thousand dollars, and now I have only two thousand, having expended five thousand upon the work of the Lord. But we cannot go on in this way any longer. I call on you, brethren, to obey God's command, and take stock, even though you may not dress so finely as you do now, or build such fine houses. Let not the poor man say, I am too poor; but let the poor man contribute out of his poverty, and the rich man out of his wealth, and God will give you a blessing.'

"During this address, I noticed some of the English emigrants whom I had seen a few days previously on board the steam-boat at St. Louis. They were listening with fixed attention, and, doubtless, considering how many of their hard-earned sovereigns should be devoted to the pious work of building a fine hotel for the prophet and his posterity. The thought arose in my mind, that these earnest appeals for money were designed mainly for the ears of the three hundred green saints who had just arrived.

"This address being concluded, two other elders followed in a similar strain. They spoke with great fluency, and appeared equally familiar with worldly business and operations in finance as with prophecies and the book of Mormon. At length, having, as they supposed, wrought up the zeal of the congregation to a sufficient pitch, they called on all believers in the book of Mormon, who felt disposed to take stock, to come forward before the congregation, and give in their names with the amount of their subscriptions. Upon this appeal there was much whispering among the audience; and I detected two Mormons, apparently from Yorkshire, in the very act of nodding and winking at each other. However, none came forward; and one of the elders coolly remarked, that as they appeared not to have made up their minds as to the amount which they would take, he requested all who wished to become stock-holders to come to his house the next afternoon at five o'clock.

"The elder who had delivered the first discourse now rose, and said that a certain brother, whom he named, had lost a keg of white lead. 'Now,' said he, 'if any of the brethren present has taken it by mistake, thinking it was his own, he ought to restore it; but if any of the brethren present has stolen the keg, much more ought he to restore it; or else, may be he will get *cotched;* and that, too, within the corporation limits of the city of Nauvoo.'

"Another person rose and stated that he had lost a ten-dollar bill. He had never lost any money before in his life; he always kept it very safely; but now a ten-dollar bill had escaped from him, and if any of the brethren had found it, or taken it, he hoped it would be restored.

"A hymn was now sung, and the service (if such it may be called) having continued from half-past ten o'clock till two, finally concluded.

As the congregation dispersed, I walked with the Mormon who had brought me over in his canoe, to see the temple. The building is a hundred and twenty feet in length, by eighty in breadth, and is designed to be the finest edifice west of Philadelphia. The Mormon informed me, that in this house the Lord designed to reveal unto his Church things which had been kept secret from the foundation of the world; and that He had declared that He would here restore the fulness of the priesthood. He showed me the great baptismal font, which is completed, and stands at the centre of the unfinished temple. This font is, in fact, a capacious laver, eighteen or twenty feet square, and about four in depth. It rests upon the backs of twelve oxen, as large as life, and tolerably well sculptured; but for some reason, perhaps mystical, entirely destitute of *feet*, though possessed of legs. The laver and oxen are of wood, and painted white; but are to be hereafter gilded, or covered with plates of gold. At this place baptisms for the dead are to be celebrated, as well as baptisms for the healing of diseases; but baptisms for the remission of sins are to be performed in the Mississippi. My companion told me that he was originally a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada; but that he had obtained greater light, and had been led to join the 'latter-day saints.' While he was a Methodist, he felt that he was perfectly right, and could confute all other sects, except the Roman Catholics. These had so much of the true and ancient Church mixed up with their corruptions, that he could not readily confute them. Many passages of the Scriptures remained at that time perfectly inexplicable to him, and he felt that no denomination was organized exactly on the primitive plan. But since he had been led to embrace Mormonism, new light had opened upon his soul; the Scriptures had become perfectly clear, and he had discovered a Church entirely conformable to the primitive model: having the same divinely-appointed ministry; the same miraculous gifts of healing, and the unknown tongues: the same prophetical inspiration; the same close intercourse with the Almighty."

Our limits will not allow us to quote Mr. Caswall's visit next day to the "Office of Joseph Smith, President of the Church of Latter-Day Saints," and the collection of Mormon curiosities therein. Mr. Smith was not at home, having gone to Carthage that morning; but his fellow-prophets offered to send for him express, assuring Mr. Caswall that he had come to the right man to explain the MS. which he exhibited, and eventually persuading him to stay till Tuesday. Mr. Caswall had an interview with the prophet's mother, who gave him an account of her son's early years which clearly indicated that she was herself no dupe, but a party to the imposture. He requested her to furnish him with a "Book of Mormon." She accordingly permitted him to take one of the first edition, belonging to her daughter Lavinia, for which he paid the young lady a dollar. We have seen this identical volume, which has all the look of having been

well read. As for the contents, they are *mainly* a hodge podge of Scripture, the purely inventive part bearing but a small proportion to the whole. In half-a-dozen places where we have opened, the matter is very much the sort of stuff which a vast proportion of our countrymen hear "at meeting" every Sunday. We should not have been the least startled to have heard it from one of our common field preachers. It is well known now that it originated in the circumstance of a romance, composed by a Methodist preacher for his private amusement, falling into worse hands, and, after some years, appearing, a good deal enlarged, as a new revelation, pretended to be copied from certain golden plates, which Joseph Smith's mother assured Mr. Caswall she had seen and handled.

It appears this is by no means the first delusion of the kind in these melancholy regions, which indeed are lands of darkness, and lying in the shadow of death. Mr. Caswall gives some account of another notorious deceiver, one Matthias. These false prophets, one and all, strange to say, have no success whatever with the Indians. They have the greatest possible contempt for Joseph Smith, and denominate him Tshe-wál-lis-ke, which signifies a rascal. On Tuesday Mr. Caswall, having in the meantime seen and heard a good deal which we pass over, kept his engagement with the Mormons.

"On landing at Nauvoo, I proceeded with the Doctor along the street which I mentioned before as bordering on the strand. As I advanced with my book in my hand, numerous Mormons came forth from their dwellings, begging to be allowed to see its mysterious pages; and by the time I reached the prophet's house, they amounted to a perfect crowd. I met Joseph Smith at a short distance from his dwelling, and was regularly introduced to him. I had the honour of an interview with him who is the prophet, a seer, a merchant, a 'revelator,' a president, an elder, an editor, and the general of the 'Nauvoo legion.' He is a coarse, plebeian person in aspect, and his countenance exhibits a curious mixture of the knave and the clown. His hands are large and fat, and on one of his fingers he wears a massive gold ring, upon which I saw an inscription. His dress was of coarse country manufacture, and his white hat was enveloped by a piece of black crape as a sign of mourning for his deceased brother, Don Carlos Smith, the late editor of the 'Times and Seasons.' His age is about thirty-five. I had not an opportunity of observing his eyes, as he appears deficient in that open, straightforward look which characterizes an honest man. He led the way to his house, accompanied by a host of elders, bishops, preachers, and common Mormons. On entering the house, chairs were provided for the prophet and myself, while the curious and gaping crowd remained standing. I handed the book to the prophet, and begged him to explain its contents. He asked me if I had any idea of its meaning.

I replied, that I believed it to be a Greek Psalter; but that I should like to hear his opinion. 'No,' he said; 'it ain't Greek at all; except perhaps, a few words. What ain't Greek, is Egyptian; and what ain't Egyptian, is Greek. This book is very valuable. *It is a dictionary of Egyptian Hieroglyphics.*' Pointing to the capital letters at the commencement of each verse, he said: 'Them figures is Egyptian hieroglyphics; and them which follows, is the interpretation of the hieroglyphics, written in the reformed Egyptian. Them characters is like the letters that was engraved on the golden plates.' Upon this the Mormons around began to congratulate me on the information I was receiving. 'There,' they said, 'we told you so—we told you that our prophet would give you satisfaction. None but our prophet can explain these mysteries.' The prophet now turned to me and said, 'this book ain't of no use to you, you don't understand it.' 'Oh yes,' I replied, 'it is of some use; for if I were in want of money, I could sell it, and obtain, perhaps, enough to live on for a whole year.' 'But what will you take for it?' said the prophet and his elders. 'My price,' I replied, 'is higher than you would be willing to give.' 'What price is that?' they eagerly demanded. I replied, 'I will not tell you what price I would take; but if you were to offer me this moment nine hundred dollars in gold for it, you should not have it.' They then repeated their request that I should lend it to them until their prophet should have time to translate it, and promised me the most ample security; but I declined all their proposals. I placed the book in several envelopes, and as I deliberately tied knot after knot, the countenances of many among them gradually sunk into an expression of great despondency. Having exhibited the book to the prophet, I requested him in return to show me his papyrus; and to give me his own explanation, which I had hitherto received only at second hand. He proceeded with me to his office, accompanied by the multitude. He produced the glass frames which I had seen on the previous day; but he did not appear very forward to explain the figures. I pointed to a particular hieroglyphic, and requested him to expound its meaning. No answer being returned, I looked up, and behold! the prophet had disappeared. The Mormons told me that he had just stepped out, and would probably soon return. I waited some time, but in vain: and at length descended to the street in front of the store. Here I heard the noise of wheels, and presently I saw the prophet in his waggon, flourishing his whip and driving away as fast as two fine horses could draw him. As he disappeared from view, enveloped in a cloud of dust, I felt that I had turned over another page in the great book of human nature."—pp. 34—37.

A spirited conversation, however, ensued with the surrounding Mormons, in which Mr. Caswall's ingenuity was fully put to the test, and if he tells his tale aright, he acquitted himself very respectably, though it is not always the truth that triumphs in a public discussion. He had alternately to attack and defend. The Mormons, remote as they are, seem quite up to the whole Anglican controversy in all its aspects. The Church of England had a form of godliness, but denied the power thereof; it repu-

diated the possession of miraculous gifts; its ministers were dumb dogs; the Thirty-nine Articles were a bundle of inconsistencies, as a Mormon proved, *e. g.* by comparing the words in the first article, "without body, parts, or passions," with the second and fourth articles; the Church of England had not true baptism, or a true commission, for it showed no present miracles, and its succession was through "the mother of harlots;" it was merely a parliament Church, &c. &c. Mr. Caswall wound up the controversy with an effective "improvement" upon the exposure the prophet had made, and the profane character of the "Sabbath services."

Mr. Caswall gives a good many anecdotes illustrative of the actual standard of Mormon morality, which is not high, if we judge from a list of robberies suffered by his host, one Mr. K., during the three years since the settlement of these religionists at Montrose and Nauvoo. The list is as long and copious as the catalogue of a good auction sale; one only wonders how Mr. K. was able to replenish his store in pace with so rapid a process of exhaustion. He must have charged very high to his lawful, that is, his daylight customers, to make up for those who took what they wanted without the regularity of mercantile transactions. His estate was treated as Penelope treated her web. But then it must be remembered that he was not one of the Saints, and Joseph Smith had publicly sanctioned the principle of spoiling the Egyptians. Of this prophet himself some amusing stories are told. He appears not to burthen himself and his position with any very troublesome sense of dignity and responsibility; and when occasionally off his guard, exhibits a humour approaching to *naivété*. That the system, mad as it is, has still method in its madness, and has a good many shrewd and calculating heads at work in its maintenance and propagation, any one may see from only a cursory look over the pages of the "Times and Seasons," which is the Mormonite Gazette, and is written with a wonderful degree of ingenuity and acquaintance with the popular theology of the day. It is Mr. Caswall's deliberate opinion, from what he has seen, that whatever may befal the originators of this villany, it has the elements of increase and endurance. "It remains (under God)," he says, "for Christians of the present day to determine whether Mormonism shall sink to the level of those fanatical sects which, like new stars, have blazed for a little while, and then sunk into obscurity; or whether, like a second Mahometanism, it shall extend itself sword in hand, until, throughout Western America, Christianity shall be levelled with the dust."

The plan of emigration suggested in the following closing sentence we particularly recommend to our readers' attention.

It was the way in which French Canada was first settled by a race of men whose tone of religion and morality is admitted on all hands to be as yet without equal in the western world.

"It is also worthy of remark, that the success of Joseph Smith appears to warrant a system of emigration and settlement conducted on religious principles. The notorious Owen, as is well known, attempted the establishment of an Infidel community at New Harmony, in Indiana, and totally failed. Joseph Smith has availed himself of the religious principle natural to man, and has triumphantly succeeded. If a false faith has thus prevailed, true religion might accomplish wonders. Whatever may be said, and much may be said with truth, respecting the superior claims of the British colonies, it is certain that a vast proportion of those who emigrate from Great Britain and Ireland, proceed to the United States. Numbers of these have been educated in the principles of the Established Church; and yet, from various causes, few of them comparatively attach themselves to the Church in America. Many connect themselves with various dissenting denominations; while still more, it is to be feared, sink into heartless apathy and irreligion. But we will suppose that a large body of members of the Church determine upon emigrating, on a system which shall secure mutual co-operation and religious fellowship. Before leaving home, the outlines of their plan are fixed: they are accompanied by a sufficient number of well-educated pastors and teachers: they purchase a district of four or five thousand acres in a healthy portion of Iowa, for example: they obtain from the legislature charters for a city, a college, and a church, respectively: they erect their own dwellings upon a handsome and tasteful design: they elect a mayor and corporation for their rising city. A substantial Church is built which may afterwards form one wing of a noble Gothic Cathedral. Schools and teachers are provided for the children, professors are appointed for the college, libraries are commenced, and halls are erected. Allotments of land are set aside for the perpetual maintenance of religion and Christian education. The clergy, if sufficiently numerous, elect, with the approbation of the laity, some learned and active man as their bishop, who is afterwards duly consecrated by the authorities of the American Church. The Church now appears in its fulness and dignity; the missionaries go forth from the city, in sincerity and truth, to traverse the land and to convert its inhabitants.

"This is not a chimerical idea, it is a sketch of what might be realized with little difficulty. Discouragements would occasionally arise; but ultimately, with proper management, such a plan would undoubtedly succeed. A new point of attraction would thus be presented to European and American emigrants, and the power of the false prophet would be shaken to its foundation."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The long expected translation of "Fleury's Ecclesiastical History from the Second Ecumenical Council to the End of the Fourth Century" has appeared (J. H. Parker and Rivingtons). The translation is virtually a new one; and is illustrated with numerous notes. A very copious and important Essay is prefixed on the miracles of the period, in which they are examined both as to the general question, and also as to the details of many particular miracles, on the principles usually adopted by the apologists of the Scripture narrative. As we shall probably soon revert to this awful subject, the miraculous authentication of the Catholic system, we shall only remark at present that the Essay is a full reply to the objections and insinuations of such writers as Middleton, Jortin, Gibbon, Milman, the writer of Ancient Christianity, &c., as also Warburton, Campbell, Professor Robinson, &c.

Archdeacon Manning's treatise on "The Unity of the Church" (Murray) is a work not to be done justice to in a few sentences, though more cannot now be attempted. It shows extensive reading, great powers of reflection and discrimination, and an ardent zeal for unity, softened, if we may use the expression, with an amiable tenderness towards those who are excluded from its doctrinal definition; excluded, that is, rather by the force of circumstances and the sins of others, than by their own spontaneous act. The following words from the introduction will best explain his plan:—"I have treated the subject of unity in three aspects: first, its positive nature, or *what* it is by the ordinance of God; next, so far as Holy Scripture will carry us, the end and design, or *why* God has so ordained the scheme of our redemption; and, lastly, the existing anomalies of the Christian world, or how we may reconcile the exact doctrine of unity with the irregularities which are visible around us." At the risk of misrepresenting the Archdeacon's view, we should say that he takes refuge from the distressing perplexities of the question in the consideration of the "moral habit" of unity; "not grounded on agreement of opinion, but producing it; resting on the unity of will to which it is pledged, that, if in anything we are otherwise-minded, God shall reveal even that unto us." He considers that the evident oneness of the Church to each individual Christian, especially as represented in the one bishop, if duly recognized and received into the heart and mind, is sufficient for the individual Christian, so as all other Christian verities be retained. This view will at least be very consoling to that great mass of Christians who, while they are morally disposed to unity, are also not prompted by temper or circumstances to look beyond their immediate sphere. As was to be expected in ever so careful a consideration of such a subject, there are expressions, and perhaps omissions, which it is not easy to

reconcile with the general tenor. It is then with no small gratification that we find the following sentence concluding the work, showing that however much the *temper* of unity is urged as the cure and the solace of existing divisions, it is not put forward in any sense as a sufficient substitute for actual unity. "Here, then, we may leave the subject of this work; believing and hoping that although for our sins the Church be now miserably divided, it may yet be once more united. Let us only believe that it still retains the powers of recovery: we are divided because we have so little faith in the grace of unity. Let us steadfastly trust that our long lost heir-loom will once more be found, when, by the grace of God, the pride and arrogance, the selfishness, and contentious spirit of man are brought down to the primitive traditions of the once holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

The design of Mr. Hamilton's "Family Services" (Graham, Oxford) is excellent. Almost every serious churchman has felt the want of some book of domestic devotions, that should agree with the Prayer Book both in plan and in tone, without appearing to stand in the stead of daily public prayer. The great majority of "family prayers" that have come down to us from the last age, and which by this time have the charm of old use and early associations, do not thoroughly harmonize with the Prayer Book. They are too like sermons, or meditations, or mementos of duty, instead of prayers and intercessions. They are also often composed in a style only in keeping with unusually high-strained feelings, which therefore creates an appearance of carelessness and irreverence, when they are read with that lower degree of expression (reverential as it may be), which suits a regular daily service, joined in by all the members of perhaps a numerous household. And they are very seldom drawn up with responses,—the only way of securing that all shall really join. Again, some recent and very laudable attempts to draw up forms of domestic devotion in keeping with the Prayer Book, have run into the very great error, as it appears to us, of merely taking the Prayer Book to pieces and rearranging it in a new and far less appropriate order: a plan which either supposes no attendance on the daily service of the Church, or entails very great and painful repetition; and in some instances startles and even shocks the mind by the *common* use of particular prayers proper to the most solemn occasions. Mr. Hamilton appears to have had these defects in his eye, and though we cannot venture to pronounce decidedly on his success without that thorough acquaintance with the book which use only can give, we think we can recommend it. It is drawn from ancient sources; is in a calm and peaceful tone; presents sufficient variety, and is adapted to secure attention. The services of the several days are arranged with allusion to the great works of creation, natural as well as spiritual, done upon them.

A beautiful and most seasonable office of devotion has come out, entitled "Prayers for a Blessing on the Work of Building a New Church" (Toovey), in Latin and in English; which we recommend to all who are engaged in any

such solemn undertaking, especially to those who are watching with interest the particular design in which this little book has originated. There is a Christian resolvedness and a reality in all that comes from this quarter, which one cannot fail to admire and seek to participate in.

Mr. Stanley's sermon on the death of Dr. Arnold (Crossley, Rugby) is a very beautiful and affecting composition; nay, though we cannot ourselves go completely along with his *superlatives*, the exhibition of deep and uncriticizing veneration is so rare at the present time, that we have not the heart to find severe fault. We are of course no admirers of Dr. Arnold's theology; nay, in our Number for last October, having reason to think that his high personal character was felt by some to be an argument against Catholic truth, we considered it a duty, at whatever expense of personal feeling, not merely to advert to the arguments contained in his work, but to draw attention to the serious defects of character, as compared with the true Christian standard, which his *writings* appeared to us to evince. Of that article we neither retract nor regret one word; though we may be allowed to draw attention to one sentence in it, which seems in some quarters to have escaped notice: "We have no thought of testing him by the average of writers at the present day; we have instituted the comparison, which he has himself challenged, with pure Catholic doctrine and practice: to a very great extent indeed it may be acknowledged that his faults have been those of the system in which he was educated; his excellences his own."—(p. 362.) But it is far happier when allowable, and now surely it is most allowable, to dwell in thought only on those excellences; which were indeed such as in this "day of small things" must ever make his memory dear to all lovers of genuine, unswerving, noble-minded conscientiousness. Whatever his defects, no person of our time has perhaps, both by example and precept, more impressively inculcated the lesson, which in its full signification is the *root* of all orthodoxy, as of all holiness, "Whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God."

"The Lawyer, his Character and Rule of Holy Life, after the manner of George Herbert's 'Country Parson,' by Edward O'Brien, Barrister at Law," (Pickering), is a beautiful little book, the writer of which, a most excellent and conscientious person, is now beyond the reach of criticism or praise. He treats of the lawyer as a minister of God, and "servant of his fellow-men for the attainment of justice," a view in which of course all professions and states of life ought to be regarded. The legal student will find here a calm and sensible discussion, by the light of the Gospel, of many difficulties of conscience, both those in the main road of the lawyer's profession, and also others more incidental, but not the less stumbling-blocks to the conscience. His conclusions on the questions, whether a lawyer should defend a bad cause, &c., certainly recommend themselves to an unprofessional reader. But we can easily conceive a clever lawyer who has settled his mind to an easier and a lower decision, turning Mr. O'Brien's position at once by asserting, that very few causes are really bad, very few pleas really unfair, and very few lawyers are men abso-

lutely dishonest; and that it is the barrister's office to help towards the discovery and settlement of the truth, not to pronounce upon it. However, this answer would not meet the facts of the case, nor satisfy a really conscientious person. If the question of bad causes be one of degree, still the moral maxims required to decide upon it should be absolute. Perhaps a lawyer might at first find such scruples stand in his way, but we do not think they would in the end; for, not to mention higher considerations, nothing is so wholesome and quickening to the whole moral and intellectual being as good resolutions, nothing so ruinous as moral laxity.

"The Gospel of St. Matthew, with Moral Reflections upon every Verse," by Pasquier Quesnel, the well known Jansenist writer, has been republished (Burns) from the translations made early in the last century, with a thorough correction and revision from the original French. The work itself has in its day enjoyed the greatest popularity in different schools of religion, being held in very high esteem, for a time, by Bossuet himself, whose warm commendation is quoted by the present editor; though on the further development of Jansenist opinions, the "Moral Reflections" fell under the condemnation of the Roman See, and Quesnel himself became an exile in Holland, where he died at a very advanced age. The book is exactly what its title indicates, consisting of moral improvements on the text, and immediate references to the reader's own spiritual state and progress, with scarcely any explanation, and only incidental introduction of doctrine. From the frequent bearing of the reflections upon the priestly and pastoral office, it seems more especially intended for the clergy. The editor has not thought it necessary to adhere to the very words of the text, but where he considered it expressed opinions not in accordance with the authoritative documents of the English Church, he has not hesitated to alter and omit, sometimes informing the reader in a note of his having done so and of his reasons, and sometimes not. The Preface contains a full account of the principles by which he has been guided, so that no alteration has been made rashly and inconsiderately.

Amongst other seasonable reprints we may mention "The Office for the Visitation of the Sick; with Notes from Bishop Sparrow; to which are added Prayers from Bishop Cosin and others" (Burns).

Bishop Beveridge's "Private Thoughts on Religion, and a Christian Life," has been republished (Washbourne) in a neat and convenient form. The writings of this divine, especially that before us, were found of unspeakable benefit in his day,—a day of moral and religious libertinism, and to them greatly do we owe such degree of seriousness and orthodoxy as there has existed in the Church throughout the century that is past. There are but few writers who are not to be read and recommended with caution; and Beveridge, it is well known, fell into some prevalent opinions which impair his usefulness, such as his view of imputed righteousness.

A complete edition of the works of Venerable Bede is announced by Dr. Giles, well known for several publications of great labour and research. The prospectus states that the original Latin is to be given, with a new English translation of the principal works: all the works and letters are to be collated with the MSS., and a biographical memoir to be added. As the editor justly observes, "the task is one of Herculean labour, and worthy to be undertaken at the national expense." This however is not likely at present; and when we see the Delegates of the Press at Oxford squandering away their enormous accumulations in building picture galleries and houses for professors of modern languages, we confess we think the time is distant when men of Dr. Giles's literary merits will meet the patronage their undertakings deserve. We recommend the work to the notice of all who are collecting for libraries of any pretension, whether their own, or belonging to public bodies.

The question of Tithes is one which, under existing circumstances, it seems impossible to enter upon with any practical benefit, and without positive harm and loss. There are many things to be kept, and many things to be won, of infinitely more importance, the defence and pursuit of which would be seriously embarrassed and hindered by turning aside, as it were, after any merely temporal privilege. As things now are, we are convinced that no eloquence of life or tongue or pen could save us from the general imputation of a covetous and secular temper, if we were to enter on that visionary crusade after tithes which some most single-minded and self-denying men are urging upon us. Really one does not know what could be done with tithes, supposing, what is now of course among the most inconceivable impossibilities, that a willing nation were again to render them full and overflowing upon the altar of God. Are we to give them to the ten thousand incumbents? or to the twenty-six bishops individually or in synod? or to a convocation? or to a minister of religion? We have surrendered ourselves to the State, and the State has taken away tithes, is taking away tithes, and will undoubtedly go on taking them away, as long as a single modus remains sufficient to reimburse the State for the legal expenses of the robbery. But having made our bed, we must lie upon it. While any agitation in behalf of tithes would be, in every point of view, most disastrous, the opposite course, of enduring with cheerfulness the spoiling of our goods, is already producing the best effects. Never since the Reformation has the Church so thriven, even in its temporal affairs, as since the late public acts of spoliation. Her yearly increase of churches and endowments far outstrips any possible loss. And if all these, in their turn, should be taken away from us in the present generation,—for what is more likely,—we are sure the Church would receive an ample compensation in spiritual things. Has not the Church during the last ten years, by the consent of all parties, even of our foes, become more independent, more catholic, more primitive, and altogether more spiritually minded? And might not all this be lost if she stooped to ask back her tithes? *Perhaps some day the nation will be only too happy to restore them, if peradventure the Church will then be willing to take them back.* Meanwhile, if any choose to

protest, only in order that the chain of testimony to the Divine institution of Tithes be uninterrupted, and without any view to immediate results, they have our hearty concurrence and thanks. We are led to these reflections by seeing several pamphlets on the subject, and especially the reprint of "A Dissertation on Tithes," by Bishop Andrewes, edited by a Layman, (Rivingtons), wherein our readers will at least find the case fully stated.

The faculty of catechising is a gift which may indeed be much improved by art, but must not be artificial. It has to deal with many different degrees of knowledge and capacity, and to apply itself to exigencies of the moment, for which written schemes and questions are comparatively useless. However, methods are of some use to all: and many are really unable to catechise, while still more fancy themselves unable. After a careful inspection of Mr. Beaven's "Help to Catechising" (Burns), we can recommend it strongly to those who find themselves occasionally at a loss for questions of a kind to test and bring out the knowledge of the catechumen. It would also be found a useful book to put into the hands of such persons as village schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, not only as helping them to examine, but still more for their own instruction.

We have seldom seen a more complete and useful little publication, in its way, than "The Book of Proverbs explained and illustrated," by Benjamin E. Nicholls, M.A. of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Curate of St. John's, Walthamstow (Rivingtons). It consists in the first place of an explanation of many particular proverbs by reference to the Jewish law, oriental usages and expressions, natural history, &c. What follows is a most elaborate and methodical illustration of the Proverbs, by scripture examples, verse by verse. The Proverb is given in one column; the next is an overflowing column of historical examples; and then a column of reference to parallel passages in the Bible and Prayer Book. To the opening minds and growing memories of young people the book will be especially acceptable and useful. The extreme carefulness with which it is done would alone recommend it to attention.

Ten years ago there was every expectation and every human probability of the Church of England and her services being remodelled on a lower and more doubtful basis. Hundreds of misbelieving reformers peeped out of their dark retreats in every quarter of the kingdom, and ventured to walk abroad, and even to commence their attacks in good earnest. Prayer, litany, creed, lesson, name, office, rite, sacrament, were, one might say, already grasped and seized and being carried away to be devoured in solitude and security. *That* danger is past and gone; we will not here stop to say how. But yet there are abundant indications of a spirit abroad, which is only kept down by the presence of a superior power; and is watching its opportunity. Here is one before us; a sufficient sign of what certain parties would do with the Prayer Book, if they could; a painful example, moreover, of the flagrant inconsistency between the

preaching and the prayers, which, flagrant as it is, the Church of England *allows*. Who could imagine from the pamphlet before us, a publication no longer anonymous (we do not know whether it ever was) and now several months unnoticed, that there had been a single word said, during the last fifty years, about the unwarrantableness of affixing any but the most obvious and superficial meaning to the authoritative documents of the Church! The pamphlet we refer to is "Baptism considered in Connexion (?) with Regeneration, according to the Doctrine of Scripture and the Formularies of the Church of England: being in part a reprint of a paper inserted in the Christian Herald, for January, 1840. By the Rev. John Fawcett, A.M. Perpetual Curate of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle. London: Seeleys. 1842." This is the title page; but the purport and result is, that Baptism has no connexion whatever with Regeneration, neither in infant nor adult, neither in false Christians nor true Christians: and what is more, Mr. Fawcett urges the necessity of altering the Baptismal and other services to make them express this opinion, which he admits they can with difficulty be made to do now. His view, as far as such gross inconsistencies can be called a view, is, that Baptism is, like Circumcision, only a seal, and is given on the supposition of Regeneration having taken place:—that Infant Baptism is indeed not easily to be reconciled with this view, but be that as it is, it is evidently an apostolic usage, and after the precedent of circumcision, and therefore to be observed, though an unmeaning act, and contrary to the scriptural view of Regeneration:—that whereas in the service for Adult Baptism, the candidate is supposed at the commencement not to be regenerate, and at the end to be regenerate, and whereas, as above written, he is evidently not regenerated by Baptism, the service must mean that the minister and congregation have discovered meanwhile that he is already actually regenerate by his satisfactory answers to the questions *preceding* the act of Baptism. "We may therefore conclude that the Church considers the adult candidates as regenerate, when she is satisfied with these answers. *As regenerate*, she admits them to Baptism, grants to them, *as believers*, the seal of the righteousness of faith, &c." The whole view has of course been frequently advanced elsewhere, but never did we see it more boldly followed out than here; at least not lately; for ten or twelve years back we really cannot answer for what we did not see Mr. Fawcett gives up discipline as hopeless, and wishes the services of the Church to be cut down to,—what? to make them suit the case of those who are not Christians; in other words, to turn Christianity out of the Church, and make it a system of heathenism. "If this cannot be," i.e. if the whole people cannot be made thoroughly and evidently Christian, "it is for the heads of the Church to consider whether the difficult and delicate task should not be attempted, of modifying the strong expressions in some of her services, so as to make them less offensive, and less glaringly opposite to the actual state of the times." (p. 31.)

There are some good observations bearing upon this subject in "A Letter, by an Anglo-Catholic, to the Rev. Philip Gell, M.A. Minister of St. John's Church

Derby, and Rural Dean; containing Remarks on his Sermon preached at the Visitation of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Derby, June 21, 1842." This gentleman having enunciated, as his faith, the scheme of Calvin, in its most undisguised form, and some things worse still; e. g. that holy orders have no inherent spiritual validity, that self-mortification is sinful because it must be designed as a substitute for the Atonement, &c., summarily gets over all the difficulties which the Prayer-Book throws in his way, by referring it in the mass to the Thirty-nine Articles for elucidation. Thus, he says, "*if* the Liturgy and Catechism speak of the inward and spiritual grace signified, as *part* of the Sacrament, or seem to say that the sacrament of baptism, as much as that of the Lord's Supper, is *a mean* of receiving that particular grace which is signified, they should be explained so as to harmonize with the Articles, which do already harmonize with Holy Scripture." Now, of course, whoever claims this licence of harmonizing one document of the Church by another, cannot in common fairness refuse it to others. We do not think Mr. Gell, or the clergy who requested the publication of his sermon, or the archdeacon, can possibly force the Prayer-Book to the Calvinistic scheme. To us it appears an impossibility; nothing but the fact would bring us to believe the thing could be attempted. Then let all these people at least respect what appears to them the impossible attempts of others. With English history and the Prayer-Book in his hands, Anglo-Catholic replies very sufficiently.

Our limits will only admit of a passing notice of various other Sermons and Pamphlets, some of which will repay a careful perusal: Bishop Coleridge's Sermon at the consecration of the five colonial bishops, on the "Universality of the Redeemer's Kingdom," starting with the parallel of the comprehensiveness even of the Jewish Ritual: "Redemption in Christ the true Jubilee," an eloquent sermon preached by Mr. James Anderson, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb: "God wiser than Man," a sermon preached at Manchester, during the late session of the British Association, by Mr. Parkinson, in obedience to the Queen's Letter for the distressed manufacturers: an excellent Sermon on the "Edification of the Body of Christ by the Unity of Faith and Knowledge," preached at Penzance, by Edward Shuttleworth, A.B., at the late visitation of the Bishop of Exeter: a Sermon by Mr. Girdlestone, preached, on the occasion of the late disturbances, on that important subject, "The Increase of Mankind a *Blessing*:" and a summary of the Christian scheme contained in "Four Sermons" preached in St. Paul's Chapel, Dundee, by the Rev. John B. Pratt. We feel bound to express our thankful approval of a farewell sermon preached at Liverpool by Mr. Charles T. Wilson, judiciously recommending an inquiry into the doctrines of certain writers previous to a condemnation of them: and of an earnest and striking visitation sermon by Mr. W. H. Ridley, of Hambledon, on the "Unity of the Church dependent on the Ministry."

From our sister Church in America, sorely beset and bewildered, yet still striving and still prospering, under the guidance and encouragements of her devoted and affectionate pastors, we have to acknowledge many tokens of

sympathy and remembrance, that may be of use here also. Bishop Doane's Discourses at the funeral of his friend Dr. Butler, and on "The Pentecostal Pattern," are simple and earnest enforcements of Church principles. The various annual Reports and Journals contain a great deal of information on the subject of schools, missions, and other operations, showing an activity, and method, and union, which should stir up a pious rivalry in our far happier and more privileged branch of the Catholic body.

"Ivo and Verena, or the Snowdrop" (Burns), is an early Christian romance, and one of the simplest and most attractive that has appeared of late. It can scarcely be read by the youth of the present day, without giving them a clearer insight into the design and the blessings of the Christian Church, and gently instilling the spirit of Christian devotedness.

A new tale, "Louisa, or the Bride" (Burns), has appeared from the author of the "Fairy Bower."

"Contributions of S. T. Coleridge to the Revival of Catholic Truths," constituting the July number of "The Christian's Miscellany" (Leeds, Green), are a very interesting collection of passages from the works of that profound thinker. Nothing can be more striking than these passages, viewed as the discoveries of an original mind, purified by affliction from many errors and trials, arriving only late in life at a serious consideration of religious questions, and harbouring in the truth after many perplexities and wanderings. From a writer of so sad a life and experience a perfectly harmonious and unobjectionable system of theology and religious ethics was not to be expected; but there is not a single passage in the little collection before us which may not be read, and, with occasionally a little deduction, acquiesced in with profit. It is quite a compendium, though of course a partial one, of Coleridge's religious views.

We take this opportunity of saying that a new edition of Coleridge's "Aids to Reflection" has been lately published at New York, United States (and Pickering, London), with a Preliminary Essay by Dr. M'Vickers, Professor of Moral Philosophy in Columbia College, New York. This is intended to counteract the views of an essay prefixed to another American edition by Dr. Marsh, a congregational minister of Vermont, who it appears has been trying to pervert Coleridge's philosophy of the Church, into the philosophy of a general and subjective sort of Christianity. But this is not the place to enter on such a vast discussion.

"The Modern Pulpit viewed in its relation to the State of Society" (Jackson and Walford), by Dr. Vaughan the well-known Congregationalist, author of the "Life and Opinions of Wycliffe," and other works of a similar tendency, is the expansion of a discourse delivered at the annual meeting of the new Independent College at Spring-Hall, in Birmingham. As far as we can pretend to describe a book which contains many good things, and still more bad, and more still capable of any construction whatever, it appears to us an admission

that the Pulpit, considered as the system opposed to Priestcraft, is proved by the present state of things in England to be a deplorable failure; and *therefore*, the writer concludes, must not be put in just subjection to the altar, but still more vigorously maintained in its present admitted supremacy. The chief causes of its failure have been, first, the fact of the learned education of the preaching class having raised their style above the intelligence of their hearers, or rather having kept it below the level of their enthusiasm; then the circumstance of a preaching class being apt unduly to identify its own opinions with scriptural truth; and the tendency of the hard working operative to look with envy on those who appear to live comfortably and to do nothing for it but preach and pray; *therefore* the book before us results in a college for preachers now being rebuilt or augmented at the cost of £25,000, with an endowment from estates and other sources of £1,700 per year. There is in this book what one sees especially in the works of all clever dissenters, and what everybody needs to be guarded against, a zeal to detect and lay open the evils of the social state, and the defects of existing institutions,—a zeal which contributes to pride; without a disposition to look to some higher quarter than oneself for the practical remedies, which is the part of humility. Another reflection also, of a different sort, strikes one forcibly on reading these pages, and that is, the very small difference, *in principle*, between Congregationalism and Nationalism.

The religious communications that have been lately going on with the King of Prussia on the subject of the Jerusalem Bishopric invest all his Majesty's proceedings at this time with peculiar interest. The idea of a union and consolidation of the Protestant interests against Rome, so strongly put forward of late, as the ground of the new Anglo-Prussian Church, would appear, from the following extract, to receive no countenance from his Majesty, and, to have been drawn from a partial and confined view of that illustrious person's sympathies. The walls of Newgate only witnessed one side of his Majesty's liberality; the sacred piles of Cologne have lately enjoyed the other.

We give, without further comment, his Majesty's speech delivered on laying the first stone for the completion of Cologne Cathedral. The inscription on the stone states that "the porch, which was begun on the Feast of the Assumption, A.D. 1248, with Invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. Peter the Apostle, and the Three Holy Magi, is now to be completed by the munificence of King Frederic, for a symbol of fraternal amity, and a worthy monument of Christian piety and art." His Majesty, after having attended Mass in the Cathedral, advanced with the procession to the place of the ceremonial, and "after the usual rites of the Catholic Church, and the performance of a chant, spoke as follows:

"I take this opportunity to welcome heartily the numerous guests who, as members of the Cathedral Building Association, have met here from all parts of Germany to celebrate this day. Gentlemen of Cologne, a great event is about to take place among you. Your feelings will tell you that it is no com-

mon edifice you are about to erect. *It is the offspring of the spirit of union and concord among Germans of every creed. When I reflect on this, my eyes are filled with joyful tears, and I thank God that I have lived to witness this day.* Here, where this foundation-stone is laid, will arise the noblest portals in the whole world. *Germany builds them;* may they, by the grace of God, be to her the forerunners of a new, a great, and a happy future. Far from them be all that is anti-German—that is to say, all that is base, false, and insincere. May this portal of honour never be disgraced by bad faith, or by the unworthy disunion of German princes or of the German people. The feeling that has prompted the building of these portals is the same that twenty-nine years ago made us break our chains, rolled back insult from our native land, and division from its shores; it is the same spirit which, fortified by the blessing of my departed father (the last of those three great kings), two years ago displayed itself with vigour undiminished in power and unimpaired by time; it is the spirit of German union and of German power; and oh! *may the portals of Cologne Cathedral be its most glorious triumph!* May it attest that Prussia is happy in the glory and prosperity of her own fatherland, and *in the fraternization of her different religious creeds, all one and alike in the eyes of the Divine Creator.* Join with me as I strike the trowel on the foundation-stone. Shout with me the thousand times repeated rallying cry, 'Alaaf Cologne.'"

"The Churches of Yorkshire" (Green, Leeds) are being published in numbers. The illustrations are in a superior style of stone engraving, with details on wood. The subjects of the two first numbers are very interesting: Adel, a curious Norman structure, and Methley, of a much later date. The work would, we think, be much more valuable, if it were rather less historical and more architectural. There are no ground plans, elevations, or sections of any kind.

The "First Annual Report of the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society" (Hannaford) is before us. It has set to work in earnest, and apparently on the best principles. Among other good deeds, there is one which we cannot too highly praise, and wish to see followed in every county in England. The Society has selected three of the most interesting churches in Devonshire, St. Andrew's, Collumpton, St. Mary's, Ottery, and All Saints, Kenton; procured careful drawings, *with ground plans, elevations, and transverse sections*, and put them into the hands of Mr. Le Keux, to be published in the same style as "Pugin's Normandy." Similar Societies are being established under the most promising auspices in Yorkshire and elsewhere.

The new numbers of Le Keux's Memorials of Cambridge include Queen's and Magdalene Colleges, Clare Hall, several of the public buildings, and the churches of St. Giles and St. Peter. Nothing can be more exquisite than some of the engravings. The sight of them serves to increase one's regret that the almost total restoration of this university has not been conducted in a severer and simpler taste, more in keeping with the idea of a Christian school, and with the models which the place itself supplied. Far too much has been

done for the sake of effect;—grand frontispieces, lofty elevations, well balanced wings, &c. The taste which conceived the Pitt Press is miserable; it violates the very first rule of architecture, that the exterior of a building should give some fair idea of its internal application, for nobody could guess it to be a printing office. The Italian design of the New Public Library appears to us, judging from a perspective view of one front, unnecessarily complex, tawdry and affected.

A new "Grammar of the Greek Language" has been published, chiefly a translation "from the German of Raphael Kühner," with many additions, by W. E. Jelf, M.A. Student of Christ Church (J. H. Parker, Oxford). This is the first volume, and contains the Syntax. The first portion of the Accidence is soon to follow.

"A Manual of Dignities, Privilege, and Precedence: including lists of the great Public Functionaries from the Revolution to the Present Time. By Charles R. Dodd, Esq." (Whittaker), seems a very complete work, likely to be very useful to those whose employments lead them to much communication with all orders of society, and equally interesting to that almost as numerous class who are led to inquire into the manifold usages, and complex relations of our constitutional system, by a merely scientific interest, or by a mere harmless curiosity. Which of the two last-mentioned classes we belong to ourselves, is more than we can say; for it is not very easy to describe accurately the pleasure one feels in ascertaining all the niceties of prerogative, rank, order, office, and degree, from the sovereign down to the Quaker and Moravian, whose customary styles and titles, and whose parliamentary immunities and exemptions are here stated with the most punctilious care. The chapters are headed with mottos which are always appropriate and laudatory, with one singular exception, which considering the post-revolutionary period assumed by the work, might almost bring on the author the suspicion of Jacobitism. It is from the "Pandemonium."

* * * * "I sat beside
A throned king, and was his councillor;
And we knit laws together."

Surely this is a slip.

We much grieve to find, from a very courteous letter addressed to us by Mr. Dodsworth, that we have, most unintentionally, misrepresented him in the article on Mr. Goode's work which appeared in our July number. To explain the origin of the mistake, the fairer course will perhaps be to quote parts of the passage in Mr. Dodsworth's second letter to Mr. Sibthorp, to which our remarks referred, using our own italics. "In the midst of all this controversy, it is truly gratifying to discover one important doctrine, *hitherto considered a matter of dispute*, in which, so far as I understand Mr. Sibthorp, his sentiments entirely accord with those of the Catholic Church from the beginning, and consequently with those of the best divines of the English Church since the Reformation; he affirms, in the strongest way, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is in no

other sense a propitiatory sacrifice than as it applies to us the benefit of the Sacrifice of the Cross. 'The Catechism of Trent,' he says, p. 46, 'declares no other than this, &c. that is,' he continues, 'we have by it applied to us the benefit of the Sacrifice of the Cross, the favour of God, and consequent blessings.' I must confess that the word 'applied' seems to me to put a *different meaning upon the article from that expressed by its own words, more especially when taken in connection with the doctrine of transubstantiation*, but with the meaning expressed by Mr. Sibthorp no instructed member of the Church of England can have any ground of quarrel, ... [these testimonies] may be sufficient to show that *it was not needful to leave the communion* in which Hooker and Andrewes lived and died, *because he believes in 'a propitiatory application' in the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*."—pp. 12, 13.

Our comment on this passage was as follows:—"The respected and much-esteemed divine having used harsh language against the Roman doctrine of the Mass, and having been set right by his opponent as to its real nature, handsomely and generously acknowledged his mistake, professing that as now put before him, he saw no difficulty in that doctrine. We think then, that, if the views the Oxford writers be for other reasons supposed true, Mr. Goode must be resting on no solid grounds when he expects that they will be given up should persons find at last that they are really identical with the Roman." We gather from Mr. Dodsworth's letter that he fully coincides with the last sentiment; while the second of the sentences from his work which we have put into italics, shows clearly enough that a strong opinion was entertained by *him* that Mr. Sibthorp, though agreeing with English doctrine on the subject, *differed* from that of his own Church. We have plainly then mistaken his meaning, and must tender him our unqualified apology for having so done. In fact, we ought not to have made the statement without referring a second time to his pamphlet, for which omission our only excuse is, that we were at the very end of an exceedingly long and fatiguing article, and time was pressing us close. On the other hand, it will perhaps be acknowledged, that the other two sentences which we have placed in italics, as well as the general run of the passage, made our mistake not an unnatural one; especially when added to *our own* thorough conviction (we may even say knowledge) that Mr. Sibthorp in what he said was *not* otherwise than in perfect agreement with the recognized doctrines of his own Church.

The following note to the review of the "History of Pews" was too late for insertion in the proper place.

In the illustrations of Monstrelet we find a chaplain preaching before Mary of Anjou and her court on the perils of hell, from a painting in a MS. in the possession of M. d'Aigrefeuille. The queen and all the women are represented sitting on low stools, or on their heels, it is not easy to say which, and the men are standing. The next engraving, from another painting in the same MS., gives him preaching before the king on the same subject. Here the king is sitting on a throne, and all the other men (for there are no women) are standing.

London: printed by C. Roworth and Sons, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES

IN THE

CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, AND ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

A.

Action, mankind formed and trained chiefly by, 403.
Andrewes (Bishop), new edition of his Sermons, 169—its merits, 170, 171—defects of the older editions, 171—extracts from the editor's preface, 172—peculiarities of the author's style, 173, 275, 201, 205—extracts, 177, 187—irreverent behaviour of the puritanical party in the Church in his time, 186, 187—his prayers, 187, 188—his *poetry*, 189—his mode of *iterating*, 193—examples, 194, 197—Sermon on the Resurrection, 199, 202—his sustained vivacity, 202—strength and beauty of his style, 204, 205.
Anglican Church, its state contrasted with that of the Protestant bodies abroad, 499.
Antinomianism in the Church, 44.
Aristotle, his Pantheism, 308, 309.
Atonement, doctrine of the, 217, 225.

B.

Ballads, early English ones, their religious character, 8, 9.
Becket, the first Englishman who filled the metropolitan see after the Conquest, 15.
Bible, the, neglect and practical disbelief of it in the present day, 118, 119.
Books, little advantage from the multiplicity of them, 403—the lighter species of books, 404—defects of modern publications for the young, *ib.*

C.

Camden, Surtees and Percy societies, their proceedings, 36.
Catholic System, its supposed unfavourableness to high poetical powers, 6—this accounted for, 6, 7.
Chaucer, obsoleteness of his style, 2—attempts to modernize it, 3—Catholic tone of his poetry, 9—his adoption of the English language, 25.
Chinese, their religious observances, 113.
Christ, union between Him and His people, 428.
Christianity, a principle of unity, 480.
Church, opposition to the, in the centuries preceding the Reformation, 30—popular feeling against the monasteries, *ib.*
Church Building, ancient and modern, contrasted, 106.
Church of England, struggle now going on within it, 293—not justly called *Protestant*, 501—marked distinction between it and the foreign Protestant Churches, 510.
Civilization, advance in, at the present day, 91, 93.
Coleridge, first directs public attention to the merits of the great dramatists and poets of the Elizabethan school, 1—extract from his "Table Talk," 8.
Cranmer (Archbishop), his behaviour while in prison contrasted with Ridley's, 527—his fortunate exemption from foreign religious influences, 533.

D.

D'Alembert, on the state of theology in Geneva, 483.
Dante, character of his poetry, 7.
Davison's (Rev. J.) *Works*, 367—his character, 368, 369, 381—his writings, 371—his style, 372, 373—anecdotes illustrative of his mind and temper, 374—views on education, 375—observations on criminal law, 376—and on the strictures of the Edinburgh Review respect-

ing Oxford, 377—on the poor laws, 379—on controversy, 380—on Christian knowledge, 382—on *the sea*, 383—his reverence for sacred subjects, 385—his respect for our great writers, 386—panegyric on the law, 391.

"*De Clifford*, or the Constant Man," 54—general character of Mr. Ward's writings, *ib.*—absence of interest, *ib.*—difficulty of describing a hero, 56, 57—character of De Clifford, 59, 60—the author's mistakes about Oxford, and the state of things in the University, 67, 68—*sympathy*, the tie between the old, *selfishness*, the tie between the modern, hero and the reader, 76—the author's failure in drawing the character of his hero, 77—his idolatry of fashion, 78—confounds fashion and aristocracy, 79—profuseness of his quotations, 82, 85—absence of action, 85—self-obtrusion of the author, 86.

"*Dies Iræ*," observations upon this hymn, 125.

Dissenting preaching, its general character, 240.

Dogmatism, in theology, opposed to private judgment, 480.

Drunkenness, alarming increase of, 93.

Dryden and *Pope*, their popularity on the decline, 1—their attempts to modernize Chaucer, 3, 4.

E.

Earliest English Poetry, public attention first directed to its merits by Coleridge, 1—effect of its rising popularity upon that of the poets of the eighteenth century, *ib.*—Scott's poetry akin to that of Chaucer, 2—Chaucer's style obsolete, *ib.*—its vigorous character, *ib.*—attempts to modernize it, 3—ill success of these, *ib.*—causes of the neglect into which our earliest poets have fallen, 2, 5—difference of feeling, 5—religiousness of the middle age, 5, 18—no distinction of poetry into sacred and profane, 6—Dante, 7—examples of early religious ballads, 8—decline of religious feeling in the time of Elizabeth, 9—remarkable characteristic of our earlier vernacular poetry, 15—Anglo-Saxon poetry, 16—four classes of our early English poetry, *ib.*—metrical romances. 16, 17—remaining MSS., 18—Vesper hymn for Passion Sunday, 19—version of the Psalter, *ib.*—"The Vernon MS." 21—metrical lives of the saints, 22—discrepancy between the three texts of Piers Ploughman, 23—"Manual of Sins," *ib.*—John Awdelay's poetry, 25—the moral poets, 28—Saxon paraphrase of "Dionysius Cato de Moribus," 29—"The Vision of Piers Ploughman," 31—Gower, 33—Chaucer, 33, 34.

Edward III., his reign a period of high refinement and civilization, 2—peculiar circumstances of the language, *ib.*

Elizabethan Sacred Poetry, 325—peculiar character, political and intellectual, of this era, *ib.*—"Paradyse of Daintie Devises," 327, 328—character of the poetry of this period, 329, 331, 332—superstition, 330—"Go Soul, the Bodie's Guest," the authorship of this sonnet discussed, 345—349—minor poets, 353—359—metrical versions of the Psalms, 359—362—metrical divinity, 365.

English Language, its origin, and modifications, 13—English and Normans, 14—period of its introduction among the higher ranks, 24.

English Literature, gradual decline of religious feeling in it, 8—examples of early religious poetry, *ib.*

English Stage, its origin, 10—its early religious character, 11—decline, 12.

Episcopacy, its necessity, 498.

Epistolary Correspondence, its proper characteristics, 133, 136—140—egotism, 140, 141, 144—Mrs. H. More's Correspondence, 141—specimens, 142, 143, 145—Charles Lamb's Letters, 156—158—Sir Walter Scott's, 159—163—Mrs. Tatham's, 364—366.

External evidence for Christianity, 284, 285.

F.

Faith, its nature and effects, 120, 121, 493, 496.

Faith and Works, 36—Buddicom's work on the subject, 37—his remarks on faith, 37, 42—animadversions upon them. 37, 38—modern theory of imputed righteousness, 39—definitions of faith, 40—perplexities arising from different views of the nature of faith, 41—modern doctrine of justification by faith alone, 42, 43—prohibition of this school, 43—Antinomianism in the Church, 44—characteristics of faith, 46—and of good works, *ib.*—opposite schools contrasted, 49—union of faith and works in the apostolic age, 41—inconsistency of modern views, 52.

Faith and Charity, the want of, the characteristic of the present age, 117.
Fashion, influence of, 96—100.
Fox, assisted by Grindal, 533 (*note*).
Free Grace, abuse of the doctrines of, 240
Futurity, proper views respecting, 303.

G.

Genevan Calvinists, and German Lutherans, 486—489.
German Hymns, 123—Chevalier Bunsen's collection, *ib.*—design of it, 124—its character, *ib.* 126—superiority over English collections, 124, 125—Miss Cox's selection and translation, 126, 127—specimens, 127—132.
German Lutherans, and Calvinists of Geneva, 486, 488.
Good works consistent with humility, 440—443.
Greek Church, custom in, on Easter Day, 114—not called Protestant, 503.
Greeks and Romans, their religious feasts, festivals, and offerings, 116.

H.

Hall (Bishop), characteristics of his style, 36.
Heresy, modern and ancient, points in which they differ, 478, 479.
Heurtley's Sermons, on the union between Christ and his people, 428—analysis of them, 428—432—the Sacraments, 430—defectibility of grace, *ib.*—the communion of saints, 431—duties resulting from it, *ib.*—prayer for the dead, 431 (*note*)—justification, 432—faith, 433—baptism, 434—narrowness of his views respecting the instrumentality of the Church, 435—the Lord's Supper, 436—indecision of his language on this Sacrament, *ib.*—his subjection to modern theology, 437—on the danger of self-righteousness, 439—on good works, 444—inconsistency of his opinions on these points, *ib.*—his erroneous views respecting sin after baptism—448—450.
Hindoos, religious offerings of, 115, 116.
Holiness, its connexion with Catholic doctrine, 447.
Hope (Mr.), close of his speech in the House of Lords upon the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill, 123.
Hymns, modern, animadversions upon them, 125, 126, 188.

I.

Imaginativeness, exemption from it no security against Pantheism, 308.
Imputed righteousness, modern theory of, 39.
Infidelity, continental, its fearful character, 122.
Irreverence, its alarming prevalence, 237, 238, 243.

J.

Jerusalem, bishopric of, 481.
Jewel (Bishop), his character by Davison, 388.
Johnson (Dr.), his slender acquaintance with the works of our earliest poets, 10.
Judges used formerly to preach in Sergeants'-Inn Chapel, 107 (*note*).

K.

Knox (John), effects of his turbulent proceedings, 531—Ridley's observations upon his opinions, 532, 533.

L.

Latitudinarian Theory, groundwork of it, 478—consequences of it, 479.
Legislative wisdom and operation, improvement in, at the present period, 92.
Legislature, assistance to the Church from it, not desirable in the present times, 115.
Letter-writing, 133—its characteristics, 133, 136, 138—speculations respecting the effect of the Penny Postage, 134—Mrs. H. More's correspondence, 141—specimens, 142, 143, 145—Letters of Lord Dudley and Ward, 147—their style, 148—extracts, 148—152—Letter of an American Student, 153—155—Charles Lambe's Letters, 156—158.
Liberals, their abject servility, 104.
Literature, not Christian, among a Christian people, observations on this anomaly, 35.
Liturgy, Prussian, effect of its enforcement, 124.
Love of God, destructive of selfishness, 442.
Luther, remarks on the nature of the law, 438 (*note*)—objectionable character of his theology, 446, 447.
Luther's Hymn, observations upon it, 124, 125.

Lutherans and Calvinists, their past and present state, 500.

M.

Mahometans, their religious observances, 112, 113.
Manicheism, its Pantheistic character, 310.
Marian exiles, their unhappy subjection to foreign religious influences, 533.
Materialism, its alarming prevalence,
Mendicant Orders, design and effect of their institution, 31.
Middle Age, its religiousness, 5.
Moderns, their greatest efforts imitative, 104.
Modern Theology, its character and tendency, 437—439.
Monasteries, early popular feeling against them, 30—especially in Germany, 31—difference between the English and Continental writers on this point, *ib.*—the monastic life, 396—400.
"*Mysteries*," poetical, for the instruction of the people, 10—their design and character, 11—first acted by clerks, *ib.*—Townley and Coventry "Mysteries," *ib.*—gradual decline of the practice, 11.

N.

Nations, their birth, 15.
Natural style, prevalence of, in the present day, 203.
Nestorians and Eutychians, 505.
Newman (Mr.), on sin after baptism, 448.
Niebuhr's judgment of the present condition of England, 42.

O.

Oak, English and Continental, 468.
Open Roofs, 452—St. Mary's at Bury, 453—Rattlesden, 454—Ixworth, 455 Erwarton, 456—importance of the spandril, 458—advantage of dispensing with the clerestory, 460—the barn at Tisbury, 463—the Abbot's Barn, Glastonbury, 464—Vicar's Close-Wells, 465—hall of the palace at Eltham, 467 English and Continental oak, 468—Archbishop's Palace, Croydon, 469—Crosby Hall, 470—hall of Christchurch, 471—Stratford-upon-Avon, 475.
Order of Charity, labours of, 398.
Oxford, valuable early English MSS. 36. importance of publishing them, *ib.*

P.

Palmer on Protestantism, 478—observations on the Calvinistic Reformation, 482—evangelical re-action, 485—German Lutherans, 486—remarks on the term *Protestant*, 504, 505, 508, 511, 512.
Pantheistic Tendencies, 303—Dr. Mill's refutation of Dr. Strauss's work, 304—dangers to be apprehended from this quarter among ourselves, 306—309, 311—Manicheism, 310—temptation to the adoption of the Pantheistic principle, 312—320.
Papacy, cause of its subversion in England, 31.
Parker (Archbishop), his character, 513.
Parker Society, its denomination, and proceedings, 513, 519—difficulty of fulfilling their pledge, 534, and *note*.
Party spirit, its prevalence, 297.
Paul (St.), his views respecting the nature of good works mistaken by modern theologians, 443.
People, the moral birth of a, 15, 16.
"*Piers Ploughman*," written by William de Langland, 31—design of the allegory, 31, 32.
Poetry of the Middle Age, 2—7—its religious character, 6—the Christian economy calculated to humble the poet, 7—Dante, *ib.*—decline of religious poetry in the reign of Elizabeth, 9—irreligious character of the poetry of Charles II.'s time, 10—Anglo-Saxon poetry, 16—Elizabethan poetry, 325—340.
Poor, their present condition and character, 102, 103—view of the Church Catholic respecting the poor, 525.
Pride, its meanness, 104—its mischievous operation, 440, 441.
Private Judgment, right of, 478—groundwork of it, 479—effects of it, *ib.*
Prodigal Son, design of the Parable of the, 450, 451.
Protestant, the term not in high favour in the time of Cranmer and Ridley, 524 (*note.*)
Protestantism, Continental, 481—511—meaning of the term, 502.
———— English, 294—295.
Prussian Liturgy, effect of its enforcement, 124.
Public mind, inability of to perceive its own errors and deficiencies, 97.
Purity, Church of the, at Basil, 531.
Pusey (Dr.) on the state of Protestantism in Germany, 496.

R.

Rationalism in Germany, progress of, 304, 305, 488, 497.
Rebellion, the great, effects of it, 326.
Reformation, its effect upon our literature, 326, 327.
Reformers, English, difficulties of their position, 521.
Religion in England, its present state, 105, 106—religious observances in former times, 108, 109—absence of outward evidences of religion among us, 110.
Religiousness of the middle age, 5, 6.
Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge, 205—reception of the "Tract for the Times" in which this principle is put forward, 206—effects of party spirit, 207, 208—statement of the principle, 208, 209—defence of it, 209, 210, 273—the term *Reserve* justified, 210, 213—extracts, 213—215—view of the doctrine of the Atonement, 216, 217—remarks of the Bishop of Winchester, 221—the principle of Reserve exemplified in the conduct of those who condemn it, 231, 232—application of the principle to our present circumstances and character, 237, 239, 243.
Reward, future, Christians to look forward to it, 443.
Rich, their condition and character at the present day, 101, 102.
Richard I., his reign the period of the ascendancy of French influence in England, 24.
Ridley's (Bishop) *Remains*, 513—Anecdote of, related by Strype, *ib.*—edition of his works by the Religious Tract Society, 514—and by the Parker Society, 513, 515—Treatises attributed to him on doubtful grounds, 515—Treatise on Image Worship, 516—defects of the last edition, by Mr. Christmas, 517, 518, 529, 532—the Corpus MS. 519—Ridley's character, 520, 546, 547—his influence with Cranmer, 520, 521—difficulties of the Church, 621—proceedings against Bonner, *ib.*—suppression of the See of Winchester, *ib.*—proceedings during his visitation at Cambridge, 522—letter to the protector, 523—prevalence of covetousness, 524—sermon preached before Edward VI., *ib.*—letter to Cecil, 525—his conduct in reference to Mary's succession, *ib.*—his behaviour while in prison, contrasted with Cranmer's, 527—reconciled to Hooper, 527, 528—Coverdale's incorrect statement of his opinions respecting predestination, 529—dissension among the exiles at Frankfort, 531—Justification by Faith, statements of Ridley concerning it, 530, 531 (*note*)—Letter from Grindall, 531—his principles respecting the doctrines and rites of the Church, 534—his reverence for antiquity, and his accurate acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers, 535—his views of the doctrine of the Eucharist, 535, 546—grounds of his opinions, 544, 545—his substitution of tables for altars, 556, 537—utility of his writings at the present day, 546.
Romish Missionaries, their zeal and devotedness, 447.

S.

Sandys (Archbishop), his works published by the Parker Society, 533—his opinions respecting the ritual of the Church, 533, 534—his notion respecting toleration, *ib.*
Scepticism, its nature and tendency, 122.
Scott (Sir Walter), his poetry, character of it, 2—akin to that of Chaucer, *ib.*—absence of interest in the heroes in his novels, 56.
Scriptural Truth, way in which the mind is ordinarily led to it, 286—292.
Self-righteousness, danger of it, 438, 441,
Selfish principle, its nature and tendency, 442, 495.
Shakspeare, his gradual advance to popularity, 1—religiousness of his mind, 9—its Catholicity, 10.
Sin after Baptism, observations on, 448—451.
Subjective character of modern religion, 316—324.

T.

Tales for Young People, 402—modern publications, their deficiencies, 404—recent signs of improvement, 405—"The Little Cousins," 406—408—"The Winter's Tale," 408—"Bertram's Dream," 409—"The Lost Brooch," 410—extracts, 413—417—neglect of the children of the higher orders, 427, 428.

Theological Works of the last century, 169.
"*Thirty-nine Articles*," design with which they were drawn up, 267.
Trent, Council of, declarations of, respecting faith and baptism, 433.

U.

Ultra Liberty, of the present day, its nature and tendency, 103, 104.
Unbelief, the Age of, 91—difficulty of determining whether there be more good or evil in the world, *ib.*—increase of drunkenness and crime, especially in the rural districts, 94—depression of trade, increase of pauperism, *ib.*—lamentable condition of children in the factories, 95—increase of standing armies, *ib.*—activity of Popery and Dissent, *ib.*—influence of fashion, 96—present state of religion among us, 105, 106—decline of church-building, clerical influence, and national religious observances, 106, 107, 108—the administration supported by infidels, 108—absence of outward evidences of religion among us, 110—irreligious behaviour of the English in the colonies, 110, 111—non-observance among us of religious festivals and processions, 112—want of faith, the characteristic of the present age, 117—and want of charity, *ib.*
Unity of the Church, a scriptural tenet, 279.

V.

Vernon MS., deserves to be printed, 36.
Voltaire, observations of, on the state of theology in Geneva, 483.

W.

Warburtonian Lectures, 387.
Warburtonian School, its character, 169.
Warton's History of English Poetry, its merits and defects, 12, 13.
Whately (Archbishop), Essays on the Kingdom of Christ, 255—duties of the civil magistrate, 258, 263, 264—ground of his doctrine, 259, 260—marks by which the kingdom of Christ is distinguished from the kingdoms of this world, 261, 262—union of the supreme temporal and spiritual power in the same hands, 264—persecution, 265—the author's imputations against the Oxford writers, 266, 267—his inconsistencies, 268, 270—and misapprehensions, 270, 272—Church system, his views respecting it, 274—silence of Holy Scripture, 275, 276—Reserve, 277—unity of the Church, 279—his inconsistency upon this head, 279, 280—and on Baptism, 281—on our Lord's teaching, 283—grounds on which God has appointed that religious truths should be embraced, 283, 284—external evidence, 284—inconsistency of Dr. Whately's principle with the recognition of a conscience, 286—spirit of party, 297—Dr. Whately's unfitness for theological inquiries, 298—his logic overrated, *ib.*—theoretical pedantry of his sermons, 299—"Scripture Revelations on a Future State," *ib.*—absence of intellectual growth, 300—self-satisfied dogmatism, 301—his writings not calculated to be permanently mischievous, 302—his waning influence, 302.
Wordsworth (Rev. C.) on evangelical repentance, 449.

London: C. Roworth and Sons, Printers, Bell Yard, Temple Bar.